2
2. L. e.

SIX DISSERTATIONS UPON DIFFERENT SUBJECTS.

LONDON,
Printed for J. WHISTON, and B WHITE, in Fleetſtreet.
MDCCLV.

MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM

PREFACE.

THE titles prefixed to each of the following Diſſertations will ſhew the ſubjects which they diſcuſs; ſubjects theological, moral, and hiſtorical, and, as ſuch, of general uſe and application. The laſt Eſſay is rather of the philological kind, and intended for thoſe who are ſomewhat converſant with the Claſſic writers and with the learned languages.

The author, by not addreſſing this volume to his Grace of Canterbury, hath done violence to his own inclinations: but though a parent would be troubleſome and preſuming, who ſhould aſk his Patron to ſtand god-father to all his children; yet he may be permitted to lay hold on any fair opportunity of obliquely recommending them to his favour and protection.

JOHN JORTIN.

CONTENTS.

DISSERTATION I.

On the doctrines of divine assistance and human liberty. p. 1.

DISSERTATION II.

On the controversies concerning predestination and grace. p. 27.

DISSERTATION III.

On the duty of judging candidly and favourably of others, and of human nature. p. 115.

DISSERTATION IV.

On the love of praise and reputation, and the proper bounds and degree of that love. p. 141.

DISSERTATION V.

On the history and the character of Balaam. p. 169.

DISSERTATION VI.

On the state of the Dead, as described by Homer and Virgil. p. 205.

DISSERTATION I.

On the doctrines of Divine Assistance and Human Liberty.

QVI FECIT TE SINE TE, NON POTEST SERVARE TE SINE TE.

DISSERTATION I.

On the doctrines of Divine Aſſiſtance and Human Liberty.

EPHES. ii. 5.

By Grace ye are ſaved.

THERE is not one queſtion in the whole compaſs of controverſial divinity that hath cauſed greater and longer diſputes and quarrels than that about irreſiſtible grace, ſpiritual aſſiſtance, original or rather hereditary ſin, abſolute predeſtination, human liberty, and the natural powers of man.

The church for the firſt four hundred years was happily free from theſe debates,

and Chriſtians were pretty well agreed in believing that man was a free agent, that he was a weak, imperfect, and treſpaſſing creature, and that God for the ſake of Chriſt was ever willing to forgive and aſſiſt him, if he was not wanting to himſelf.

But about thirteen hundred years ago, a diſſenſion aroſe concerning theſe points, and two parties were ſoon formed. The firſt maintained neceſſity, fatality, and abſolute predeſtination, election and reprobation; the ſecond were defenders of conditional decrees, and of human liberty and human power in the performance of moral good and evil; whilſt others endeavoured to ſteer a middle courſe, and this our Church is thought by ſeveral learned perſons to have intended in her articles.

The controverſy, once rouſed, hath never gone to ſleep ſince, but hath been carried on more or leſs, in moſt parts of the Chriſtian world.

Concerning the diſputants themſelves we may ſafely affirm that the defenders of the liberty of man and of the conditional decrees

decrees of God have been beyond all compariſon the more learned, judicious, and moderate men; and that ſeverity and oppreſſion hath moſt appeared on the other ſide; which was a very abſurd behaviour even upon their own principles: for if a man be a mere [a] machine, to what purpoſe would you contend with him, or apply violence to him? To make him change his opinion, you will ſay. That is impoſſible. Upon your principles, a man hath no opinions, properly ſpeaking; or they are neceſſary to him, and he cannot avoid them. And in fact it appears from hiſtory that God did not think fit to annex his irreſiſtible grace to the excommunications, anathemas, fines, baniſhments, impriſonments, and other ſuch devices uſed formerly by the predeſtinarian fataliſts to illuminate and convert their adverſaries, who only ſpread themſelves the

[a] If a man never acts, but is always acted upon, it is the mover who is the author of all that the man ſeems to do. And indeed, upon this ſyſtem, when a man ſays, *I think* or *I do* this and that, it is an illuſion; there is no ſuch thing as *I*; it is ſomething elſe, ſome external agent, good or evil; the mind can exert no act at all, not even that of thinking and reflecting; and there is an end of perſonality.

more, the more they were diſcountenanced and oppreſſed.

As to the controverſy, I would only aſk two or three plain queſtions.

How can it be ſuppoſed that God ſhould delude and deceive all mankind by making them believe that they are free agents? For all men think ſo, till by the help of ſome miſtakes and quibbles they have learned to call it in queſtion, though againſt their own inward ſenſe and hourly experience.

Why are men encumbered with a conſcience, approving, or condemning their paſt actions? Is it fit that a machine ſhould have ſuch ſentiments? Not more than that a clock ſhould be endued with a conſcience to reprove and torment it for going wrong.

Why ſhould the ſcriptures propoſe rewards and puniſhments, promiſes and threatnings, to thoſe who can do nothing at all? What ſhould we think of a man who ſhould preach to a nurſery of trees, and propoſe rewards to thoſe that ſhould grow up ſtreight, and puniſhments to thoſe that ſhould grow crooked?

Laſtly, Whence comes it to paſs that men are good or bad in ſuch a variety of degrees? For if they were all good or bad by neceſſity, the good would be all equally good, and the bad would be all equally bad. Nature and grace muſt operate uniformly; even as gravitation operates uniformly upon matter, inſtinct upon brutes, and thoſe ſecret powers upon men by which the blood circulates, the pulſe beats, the breath comes and goes, and other functions are continually performed in us without our knowledge and endeavour. From nature entirely corrupted nothing could proceed but evil; from overpowering grace nothing could proceed but good. Whence then this mixture of good and evil, of right and wrong, of defects and amendment, of depravation and improvement? It plainly ariſeth from the liberty of man, and from his uſing or abuſing it, and it can ariſe from nothing elſe.

How is it then that ſo many perſons have agreed to contradict ſuch plain notions, and by eſtabliſhing irreſiſtible influences and unavoidable neceſſity, to deſtroy the very nature of moral good and evil, and the wiſ-

dom and juſtice of God's government? Many cauſes concurred to lead them into theſe errors, namely:

The difficulty of reconciling the foreknowledge of God with the liberty of man:

The nature of human freedom itſelf, which, though ſenſibly felt, is not ſo eaſy to be accurately deſcribed and clearly comprehended:

A fear of aſcribing too little to Almighty God, and too much to weak and ſinful man in the work of amendment, improvement, perſeverance, and ſalvation:

An abhorrence for the doctrine of the merits of Saints, and works of ſupererogation, by which good men are ſuppoſed to have done more for themſelves than reaſon and religion required. A juſt diſlike of theſe notions frightened ſeveral unwary perſons into the contrary extreme, taught them to look upon [b] good works as a bugbear, and to hate the very ſound of the words.

[b] Some writers of this ſort contracted ſuch a ſuperſtitious dread of relying on *good works*, that they would

An

An injudicious method of interpreting the ſacred writings, of expounding ſingle texts, and fragments of ſcripture, without conſidering or underſtanding the ſyſtem of Chriſtianity, and the ſcope and intention of the writer, and without giving fair play to human reaſon and natural religion, but ever flying for ſhelter to myſtery and to implicit faith:

A ſuperſtitious deference to human authority, and to the judgment of men who happened to be in high repute, and leaders of the multitude. It is actually the bare weight of two or three ſuch names that introduced and eſtabliſhed the doctrine of abſolute predeſtination:

Laſtly, the infelicity of the times when theſe notions came into faſhion, times in which philoſophy, morality, divinity, and the holy ſcriptures were not ſo well underſtood as they are at preſent.

We may reaſon indeed with this ſort of people; but the only anſwer we are to ex-

not make even a *good book*, or employ the carnal weapon of human reaſon.

pect

pect is, that these are profound mysteries; for this is the last refuge and retrenchment of men who are beaten out of the field by fair reasoning. There are three senses of the word mystery.

First, by a mystery is too often meant a doctrine which is directly contrary to reason. In this sense, absolute predestination is really and truly a mystery.

Secondly, by mystery is meant a thing which is certainly true, but withal incomprehensible: reason sees plainly that it is and must be, but the imagination cannot conceive how and in what manner it is. In this sense the divine nature is mysterious. But predestination is not a mystery of this sort, since it cannot be proved to be true.

Thirdly, a mystery in the usual scripture-sense of the word, is a thing which once was not revealed, and cannot be known till it is revealed. In this sense, predestination may perhaps pass for a mystery, so far as it is a doctrine not yet revealed to us; and when it is revealed, it will be time enough to believe it.

My

My text is one of thoſe which hath been much inſiſted upon in this controverſy. " By " grace ye are ſaved." Theſe words, and ſome other places of ſcripture of the ſame kind, have been miſunderſtood by thoſe who ſuppoſe that all men are by nature irreſiſtibly led to evil, that God ſelects ſome of them to be the happy objects of his care and favour, that he beſtows upon them his grace and aſſiſtance which they cannot abuſe and reject, and thus ſecures to them everlaſting life. According to theſe notions, the words before us ought to be thus explained; " Chriſ- " tians of Epheſus, you are now certain of " eternal life, becauſe the grace of God is " conferred upon you, which no man can " fruſtrate or reſiſt." That the text muſt not be thus underſtood I ſhall ſhew diſtinctly in the following remarks, obſerving at preſent, that ſalvation here does not mean an infallible ſecurity of obtaining eternal life, and that the grace of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, whatſoever be implied in it, is not a divine aſſiſtance working all in us in ſuch a manner that we can do nothing for ourſelves.

Firſt,

Firſt, [c] the word *ſaved* doth not here ſignify the final and complete ſalvation which is obtained in heaven; but it means, to be put in a condition in which if we continue, we ſhall be ſaved. In the ſame ſenſe it is ſaid on the converſion of Zaccheus, "This day ſalvation is come to this houſe;" and in another place, "Baptiſm doth ſave us;" and again, "God added daily to his church, not ſuch as ſhould be ſaved, but ſuch as were ſaved, or ſuch as ſaved themſelves." The perſons thus ſpoken of were not then actually ſaved, but by embracing the goſpel they had choſen the way that led to ſalvation.

Secondly, the word *grace* means not an irreſiſtible aſſiſtance, which performs all our duty in us and for us.

By the grace or the favour of God we are ſaid to receive a new birth or being, and to be created in Chriſt, but as the Apoſtle adds, we are created to good works, which God ordained that we ſhould walk in them; and thoſe good works are ſo far aſcribed to us, that we are exhorted to work out our

[c] S. Clarke, Serm. xxix, xxx, xxxi. on the grace of God.

own

own ſalvation, and that a promiſe is made of glory and honour and immortality to every one that worketh good.

Therefore the text is to be thus interpreted; that you have had the Goſpel preached to you, and thereby have been changed from a ſtate of ignorance and vice to a ſtate of knowledge and virtue, and that you are now happily placed in the way of ſalvation, in which if ye continue ye ſhall obtain eternal life, that ye are thus ſaved, is of grace, is to be aſcribed entirely to the goodneſs and favour of God.

I ſhall now conſider,

I. What is the meaning of the word, *grace*;

II. How our ſalvation is owing to this *grace*;

III. How it is owing to our own endeavours.

I. The word *grace* properly ſignifies favour, from a ſuperior to an inferior. Grace is the mercy or goodneſs of a ſuperior not requiring all that he has a right to require, or

or elſe conferring benefits upon another to which the receiver hath no claim. And becauſe ſuch favours may be done in various ways, hence the word *grace* in ſcripture is applied in as various ſignifications.

Sometimes it means the miraculous gifts of the holy Ghoſt, by which the Apoſtles were enabled to prove their miſſion, to preach with authority, to confute gainſayers, to confirm the believers, and to govern the Churches. Thoſe endowments were called *grace*, becauſe they were not the fruits of their own natural abilities, or the acquiſitions of their own induſtry, but gifts of God diſtributed as God thought fit. So St. Paul ſays to the Romans; "By whom we "have received grace and Apoſtleſhip, for "obedience to the faith among all nations:" that is, who hath been pleaſed to ſend forth us the Apoſtles to preach, with mighty works and ſigns and wonders, and to call mankind to the knowledge of God and of Chriſt, and to the practiſe of righteouſneſs. And again to the Epheſians; "Unto every one of us "is given grace, according to the meaſure of "the gift of Chriſt:" and what that grace was

was he declares in the following words; --- " he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome pro- " phets and ſome paſtors and teachers."

Again, God promiſed to ſupport his ſervants under heavy trials, ſo that they ſhould not be tempted above what they were able to bear. This divine aſſiſtance may be called *grace*, though it is not uſually ſo called in ſcripture.

Thirdly, by the word *grace* is ſometimes meant all righteouſneſs in general, and every action good and praiſeworthy, all thoſe moral virtues to which the Goſpel excites us, and the practice of which recommends us to the favour of God. Thus in the epiſtle to the Epheſians, " Let no corrupt commu- " nication proceed out of your mouth, but " that which is good to the uſe of edifying, " that it may miniſter grace to the hearers;" that it may excite them to virtue. Thus St. Peter; " Grow in grace[d];" that is, in goodneſs. After the ſame manner of ſpeaking, St. Paul ſtyles the liberality of the Macedonian Churches to the poor, " the grace

[d] An exhortation extremely improper, upon the Calviniſtical ſcheme.

" of

" of God beſtowed upon them;" and to perſuade the Corinthians to do the like, he ſays; " Therefore as ye abound in every " thing, in faith, in utterance, and know- " ledge, and in all diligence, ſee that ye " abound in this grace alſo;" the grace of liberality and charity. In theſe and other places the word *grace*, denotes the ſame as Chriſtian, or moral virtue: and all the good actions that Chriſtians do are called *grace*, becauſe they are the effects which the Goſpel, together with the aſſiſtances that God beſtows upon his faithful ſervants, are wont to produce in well-diſpoſed minds.

Again, the word *grace* frequently means the mercy of God in pardoning ſin upon repentance and amendment, and receiving ſuch an offender into favour. In this ſenſe St. Paul ſays of himſelf; " I am not meet " to be called an Apoſtle, becauſe I perſecu- " ted the Church; but by the grace of " God, or the mercy of God, I am what " I am." So when the doctrine of Chriſt, in oppoſition to the law of Moſes, is called *grace*, when the preaching of the Apoſtles is called the *word of God's grace*, when St. Paul

Paul declares that repenting ſinners are juſtified freely by *grace*, and condemns the wicked doctrine of thoſe who thought that they might continue in ſin, that grace might abound, the word *grace* ſignifies that merciful and compaſſionate diſpoſition of the divine nature, whereby God doth not exert his right of puniſhing, and receives penitent ſinners upon more gracious terms and to greater degrees of favour than by the nature of juſtice he was bound to afford.

And here it may not be amiſs to guard againſt an error into which ſome writers ſeem to have fallen, and that is, to repreſent the attributes of God as in ſome manner at variance with each other, his juſtice requiring one thing, and his mercy requiring the contrary. This error ariſes from miſtaking the nature of juſtice: juſtice doth not require a perſon to do every thing that he juſtly may, but only to do nothing that is unjuſt, and to be juſt in exerciſing his power. But, to return:

Hence it is that the goſpel itſelf is frequently ſtyled *grace*, and the *grace of God*, being a promulgation of God's mercy to-

wards men diſplayed in the free pardon of ſin upon the favourable terms of repentance and amendment: as in theſe texts; "Since "the day that ye knew the grace of God in "truth: Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and "God even our father hath given us hope "through *grace:* Be ſtrong in the *grace* that "is in Chriſt Jeſus." So the prophets are declared to have propheſied of the *grace* that ſhould come; and ſome of the Galatians are ſaid to have fallen from *grace*, or to have rejected the privileges of the Goſpel, when they claimed to be juſtified by obſerving the ceremonies of the Jewiſh law. "Shall we "ſin, ſays St. Paul, becauſe we are not under "the law, but under *grace?* Far be it. "The *grace of God* hath been declared to "all men, teaching us to live as we ought:" St. Paul ſpeaks not of the *grace of God* which worketh in them, but of that *grace* or gracious revelation which inſtructs them, "that denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, "they ſhould live ſoberly, righteouſly, and "godly in this preſent world."

II. Let us now conſider how our ſalvation is owing to *grace*. By grace ye are ſaved: that

that is, to the goodneſs and favour of God it muſt altogether be aſcribed that ye have the means of obtaining eternal life.

We muſt therefore acknowledge that our exiſtence and all our powers and faculties are the free gift of God, and that every additional ſufficiency and aſſiſtance, every revealed method of obtaining religious wiſdom, every new motive to virtue, and diſſuaſive from vice, every direction and guidance in the way of life, wholly proceeds from the ſame liberality, and that the promiſe of eternal happineſs, as the reward of our imperfect endeavours, is merely an effect of God's tranſcendent goodneſs.

God is to us the only author of the powers and faculties which we commonly call natural. In him we live and move and have our being. From him we are endued with reaſon and underſtanding, with the ability of diſcerning between good and evil, with the power to will and to chuſe that which is right.

Beſides the natural powers, God affords us moreover additional helps; ſuch is the reve-

lation of the Goſpel, which is therefore ſo frequently called in ſcripture the *grace of God*, and the *grace of God which bringeth ſalvation.*

Under which general grace are included more particularly, a clearer knowledge of our duty than could be collected by the bare light of reaſon and the efforts of philoſophy, or had been communicated by preceding revelations; a plainer diſcovery of eternal life, by the doctrine of the reſurrection of the dead and of a judgment to come; promiſes of eternal glory and happineſs unſpeakable laid up for the righteous, and a declaration of indignation and wrath for the workers of iniquity; the example of Chriſt in his holy life and patient ſufferings, and the relation which he bears to us as redeemer, mediator and king, and the benefits ariſing to us from this relation; an aſſurance of the forgiveneſs of ſins upon repentance; the aſſiſtance of the divine ſpirit in the practice of our duty, ſuited to our ſituation and exigencies. By theſe means the Goſpel in the moſt effectual manner teaches and enables men to lead good lives, and to them who

are

are thus taught it is the *grace of God* which bringeth ſalvation. Thus it is that we are ſaved by *grace*; and thus much is acknowledged by thoſe Chriſtians who are the warmeſt advocates for human liberty. How then can they be fairly charged with denying the neceſſity of divine aſſiſtance, or with repreſenting man as able to obtain ſalvation by his own ſtrength and merits, as ſelf-ſufficient and independent of his Creator? No Chriſtian in his right ſenſes ever held ſuch notions as theſe, though many Chriſtians have been accuſed of it by their zealous adverſaries: but intemperate Zeal is blind, and Calumny leads it about by the hand, being appointed its conſtant guide and inſeparable companion.

As [e] to divine aſſiſtance, or the ordinary influence of the Holy Spirit upon the ſoul of man, it is not to be expected that we ſhould determine how often and upon what occaſions it is imparted, or explain in what manner it is performed, becauſe it cannot be diſtinguiſhed from the operations of the

[e] See Stinſtra's paſtoral letter, which deſerves the peruſal of every Chriſtian.

mind itſelf, as every ingenuous Chriſtian will own. No one can ſhew where the action of the human Spirit ends, and where the action of the divine Spirit begins. But as man is a rational creature, and as reaſon is the nobleſt of his faculties, we may juſtly conclude that the Holy Spirit acts upon him in a way conformable to his nature, and principally by ſtrengthning and improving his underſtanding, which will naturally have a good effect upon his behaviour; and conſequently the ſureſt evidence a Chriſtian can give of having this divine aſſiſtance, is *to reaſon juſtly*, and *to act honeſtly*. This, I ſay, is the beſt proof or teſt, though it be one which will by no means pleaſe or ſuit fanatics and enthuſiaſts.

III. Let us conſider how our ſalvation is owing to our own endeavours.

Whilſt we acknowledge the weakneſs of man, and the grace or mercy of God, we muſt be careful,

Not to make God the author of ſin, and of our corruption, by virtue of decrees eſtabliſhed by him, and not alterable by the conduct of man:

Not to repreſent him as dooming almoſt all his creatures to eternal damnation, for being in a condition which they cannot avoid, and out of which he will not help them:

Not to vilify our natural powers and faculties, as if they were good for nothing, and incapable of any thing that is uſeful and praiſe-worthy:

Not to talk contemptuouſly and injuriouſly of the light of nature, which is no other than the candle of the Lord ſhining in the breaſt of rational creatures, and almoſt the only [f] light which hath been afforded to ſo many inhabitants of this world:

Not to make a ſtate of grace a ſtate of fatality and fanaticiſm, in which men are ſuppoſed to be converted from ſin and impelled to goodneſs, like mere machines by the application of weights and ſprings. This is transforming men from rational agents into talking brutes, or walking vegetables.

Whilſt we take ſober and pious care to render to almighty God, and to Jeſus

[f] Except tradition, which was corrupted more or leſs.

Chriſt, and to the holy and ſanctifying Spirit their due honour and their juſt glory, we muſt alſo take care not to deſtroy the very nature of virtue and vice, of right and wrong, by imagining that we have no power to do any thing. We muſt acknowledge that as the natural abilities, with which God hath originally endowed men, are ſuch as they can either uſe or neglect, according to their choice and inclination; ſo the ſupernatural aſſiſtances afforded to men by the revelation of the Goſpel, and by the influence of the Spirit, are ſtill in the nature of aſſiſtances, which may either be received or rejected. Eternal life, as it is a gift of God which men could not poſſibly merit or claim by virtue of their own deſerts, ſo it is not a gift obtruded upon them whether they will or no, but the aid to obtain it is ſuch an aid as requires the concurrence of their own endeavours in the uſe and application. For this reaſon St. Peter exhorts Chriſtians to grow in grace, as a thing depending upon their own efforts, and St. Paul admoniſhes them, not to quench or to grieve the Holy Spirit of God, who will not forcibly ſtrive with thoſe who reſiſt his good impreſſions; and

and men are frequently blamed in Scripture for receiving the grace of God in vain, for reſiſting the Holy Ghoſt, and for rejecting the counſel of God againſt themſelves.

Therefore when the Scriptures tell us in ſome places that we are ſaved by *grace*, and in other places that good men work out their own ſalvation, there is no inconſiſtency in this. They are ſaved by *grace*, becauſe without God's favourable aſſiſtance and acceptance of their imperfect endeavours, they could not of themſelves acquire eternal life; and at the ſame time it is no leſs true that they work out their own ſalvation, becauſe unleſs they exert their own powers, the grace of God alone will in no wiſe force them to be ſaved. Thus God's working in or with us, and our working together with God are eaſily reconciled. And ſo likewiſe are thoſe places of ſcripture in which the wicked are repreſented uſually as hardening themſelves, and ſometimes as being hardened of God. They harden themſelves, becauſe it is by their own choice, by their own obſtinacy and perverſeneſs that they become obdurate; and they are hardened of God,

God, not by any proper and immediate act of God depriving them of reaſon and liberty, or compelling them to do evil; but quite on the contrary, by his continuing to give them both motives and opportunities to do well, which gifts being rejected and abuſed, are the innocent cauſe, or the occaſion of their greater wickedneſs, and in this ſenſe they are hardened by the very goodneſs of God. Beſides, in the ſtyle of the Scriptures, God is often ſaid to do what he only permits to be done, and in all other languages alſo, the occaſion is put for the cauſe, both as to perſons and as to things. "I came "not to ſend peace upon earth, but a ſword," ſays our Lord; that is, my Goſpel, though it ought to produce peace and love, will prove the occaſion of ſtrife and enmity.

Thus the doctrine of divine grace and the doctrine of free will, or human liberty, unite and conſpire in a friendly manner to our everlaſting good. The firſt is adapted to excite in us gratitude, faith, and humility; the ſecond to awaken our caution, and to quicken our diligence.

DIS-

DISSERTATION II.

On the Controverſies concerning Predeſtination and Grace.

STVLTI MVLTVM IIS PROSVNT QVI EORVM EXEMPLO SAPERE DISCVNT.

DISSERTATION II.

On the Controverſies concerning Predeſtination and Grace.

ABOUT the beginning of the fifth century aroſe a religious quarrel between our country-man Pelagius, a defender of free will or human liberty, and Auguſtin who was a fataliſt; an obſcure [a] and intricate controverſy concerning divine aſſiſtance, or *grace*, as they called it, freedom of acting, and predeſtination,

Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge abſolute;

a controverſy, which after it once began, ne-

[a] Our King James the firſt made an edict, that no divine, under the dignity of a biſhop or a dean, ſhould preſume to preach upon the profound myſteries of Predeſtination. I ſhall leave it to the reader to make ſuch remarks as he thinks proper upon this ſuperannuated edict.

ver

ver ceaſed, but hath been carried on by Calviniſts, Arminians, Janſeniſts, Jeſuits, Fataliſts, &c.

Auguſtin in the days of his youth had been ſeduced by the Manichæans: afterwards he ſaw through the errors and abſurdities of the ſect, and forſook it. But when he was become an orthodox biſhop, he propagated and defended the doctrine of predeſtinarian fatality, and the doctrine of perſecution; for which poſterity is little obliged to him.

As to the affair of perſecution, he ſeems to have been ſevere by religion, and gentle by temper; which ſhews how important and neceſſary it is to have reaſonable principles, without which the beſt-natured man is capable of doing the moſt ill-natured actions. Upon many occaſions he interceded for the mitigation of the penalties againſt Pagans, Heretics, and Schiſmatics, even when they deſerved puniſhment for their ſeditions, riots, depredations, and murders. In this reſpect he was mild even to an exceſs; for as men ſhould not be perſecuted and oppreſſed for ſpeculative opinions, ſo they, who

who under the maſk of religion, or through mere wickedneſs, rob, plunder, maim, wound, and aſſaſſinate, ſhould never go unpuniſhed, and ſhould be made examples, for the ſecurity of the government, and the good of civil ſociety. This fooliſh mildneſs was afterwards preached up and obſerved by ſeveral religious perſons. Thus in the eighth century, when two brothers of Gregory, biſhop of Utrecht, were murdered in a foreſt by ſome robbers, and the aſſaſſins were taken and ſent to Gregory, to be treated as he thought fit, he clothed and fed and diſmiſſed them, bidding them go and ſin no more. *Fleury*, Hiſt. Eccl. ix. 479. The law of God ſays, *Whoſo ſheddeth man's blood, by man ſhall his blood be ſhed:* but it hath been a common practice with ſuperſtitious Chriſtians, to burn Heretics, and to ſpare the vileſt malefactors at the ſame time.

Auguſtin, ſpeaking of the ſtoical doctrine, that all ſins are equal, treats it as [b] *an inſult upon common ſenſe.* And yet he could not ſee that his own ſyſtem was more abſurd

[b] De parilitate peccatorum ſoli auſi ſunt diſputare contra omnem ſenſum generis humani.

than

than all the ſtoical paradoxes put together. What would a Stoic have ſaid, if he had heard a Chriſtian philoſopher affirm, that an infant, dying the ſame day in which he was born, was eternally damned for the ſin of Adam?

Non ſani eſſe hominis non ſanus juret Oreſtes.

This ſtoical doctrine, at the bottom, was only a quibble. Theſe philoſophers meant by it, that all ſins were ſo far alike, as they were deviations from the rule of reaſon; that all actions which are not right, are wrong, and equally deſerve to be called ſo; juſt as all lines which are not ſtrait, are crooked.

Their doctrine, that *pain is no evil*, is another quibble. They were not ſo abſurd as to hold that pain was not painful and inconvenient; they only meant that it was no moral evil.

Fauſtus, a Semipelagian biſhop, diſputing againſt Auguſtin, ſays, [c] *If one is doomed*

[c] Si ergo unus ad vitam, alter ad perditionem, ut aſſerunt, deputatus eſt, ſicut quidam Sanctorum dixit, non judicandi naſcimur, ſed judicati. *De Lib. Arb.* i. 4.

to

to life, and another to perdition, we are not born that we may be judged, but we are judged before we are born. The remark is juſt, and ten Auguſtins and Calvins cannot anſwer it.

Auguſtin fell into his predeſtinarian notions, as Le Clerc obſerves, firſt by retaining ſome of his Manichæiſm; ſecondly by meditating upon the epiſtles of St. Paul, which he underſtood not, having only a ſlender knowledge of the Greek tongue and of the ancient fathers; and thirdly by a ſpecial grace and illumination which he fancied to have been conferred upon himſelf.

This *Doctor of grace* had another notion, which is productive of many bad conſequences, namely, that Heretics have no right to their own goods and chattels. See Barbeyrac *Mor. des P.* 297.

According to Du Pin, he had a fine genius, and much vivacity and penetration, and was a ſkilful diſputant. From general principles he drew a vaſt variety of conſequences, and formed a ſyſtem which is tolerably well connected in all its parts. He

often quitted the ſentiments of thoſe who had been before him, and ſtruck out new methods and interpretations. He was, as Cicero ſaid of himſelf, *magnus* [b] *opinator*, a great advancer of ſentiments which were only conjectures and probabilities. He had leſs learning than genius, was not ſkilled in the languages, and had read little of the ancients. His ſtyle was fluent, but not polite and elegant, nor free from barbariſms. He was full of repetitions, and eternally dwelling upon the ſame ſubjects. He hath diſcuſſed all ſorts of points and queſtions, and from his writings was formed that body of theology which was adopted by the Latin fathers who aroſe after him, and in a great meaſure by the ſcholaſtic Divines [c].

The ſtyle of Pelagius, ſays Du Pin, is dry and low. He had little ſcience, but

[b] As *opinator* is a man who propoſes dubious opinions in a dubious manner, Auguſtin ought perhaps rather to be called, in ſcholaſtic Latin, *Magnus dogmatizator*.

[c] See an epiſtle of Eraſmus to Eckius, p. 397. in which he ſets Auguſtin far below Jerom, and with great reaſon. Auguſtin, as he obſerves, is, *Scriptor et obſcuræ ſubtilitatis, et parum amœnæ prolixitatis.* Epiſt. 1000. *Scriptor* ἀπεραντολόγος. Epiſt. 1004.

good

good ſenſe enough; and his reflections are ſhort and judicious.

If Pelagianiſm was a rejecting of divine aſſiſtance, it deſerved to be rejected as a falſe doctrine; but whether the poor Pelagians had ſuch notions, and aſcribed too much to man and too little to God, this is quite another queſtion, for the determining of which we muſt not at all rely upon the teſtimony of their ignorant, cruel, and boiſterous adverſaries. One thing ſeems to be extremely plain and undeniable, that what was afterwards called Semipelagianiſm was the very doctrine of all the Greek fathers, from Juſtin Martyr down to Chryſoſtom and the writers of the fifth century.

Tillemont, after having vainly endeavoured to ſhew that Chryſoſtom (according to his notions of orthodoxy) was orthodox in this point, thus concludes; "This however is certain, that he was not choſen of God to make the Church triumph over the Pelagian hereſy, nor have the Popes, councils, and tradition propoſed him to us as the *Doctor of grace*; and therefore they who ſhould go and ſeek in his writings, what is the doctrine of the

Church concerning this article of faith, would be like thoſe who ſhould ſeek in Origen what we ought to think concerning the Trinity, inſtead of conſulting Saint Athanaſius." H. E. xi. 358.

This wants no commentary, and is much the ſame thing as ſaying more openly, *Cave canem.* Have a care of Chryſoſtom and of the Greek fathers, on the article of predeſtination. Submit yourſelves humbly to the divine authority of Popes, councils, and tradition.

S. Baſnage, in his large account of the Pelagian hereſy, *Annal.* iii. writes in the true ſpirit of a party-man. The hiſtorian diſappears, and in his room you find the bigotted Calviniſt. I ſhall therefore make little uſe of him upon this occaſion.

" There is no one queſtion which has raiſed greater controverſies in the Church, than that concerning the grace of God and the power of man. Some, in order to vindicate God from being the author of ſin, have been ſo ſollicitous to maintain the perfect freedom of mens faculties, and their liberty of chuſing

ſing good or evil, that they either have, or have been thought to have diminiſhed from the abſoluteneſs of the ſovereignty, or from the efficacy of the grace of God. They have been thought, I ſay, to diminiſh from the grace of God: for whether they have really done ſo, or only by their adverſaries have been repreſented as doing ſo, is not very evident. —— Others, in the contrary extreme, that they might be ſure not to aſcribe too little to the efficacy of the divine grace, have ſuppoſed men to have no natural powers at all of acting or willing, no uſe of the original faculties given them at their creation, no liberty of will or freedom of choice in matters of morality and religion. By which doctrine they have conſequently (even themſelves ſeeing and acknowledging the conſequence) introduced an abſolute neceſſity and fatality upon mens actions. From whence it follows, in the next ſtep of deduction (though this indeed they are not willing to ſee) but in truth it does neceſſarily and unavoidably follow, that God himſelf, and not man, will be the author of ſin." S. Clarke, Serm. xxx.

" One cauſe of trouble of mind to melancholy pious perſons, is an apprehenſion that poſſibly they may be excluded from mercy, by ſome poſitive decree and foreappointment of God. From nature and reaſon this apprehenſion cannot ariſe, becauſe it is abſolutely contrary to all our natural notions of the divine attributes, to conceive that the infinitely merciful and good God, whoſe tender mercies are over all his works, ſhould for his own pleaſure, and not for any wickedneſs of theirs, eternally decree any of his creatures to be miſerable. Neither in Scripture indeed, any more than in the reaſon of things (but only in the writings of ſome unſkilful interpreters) is there any foundation for any ſuch apprehenſion. For ſuppoſing there be ſome few obſcure texts, which unſtable perſons may be apt to miſinterpret to their own and others diſquiet; yet is it not fit that the whole tenour, the whole deſign and perpetual aim of Scripture, ſhould be the interpreter of particular paſſages? And is not this the whole current of Scripture from one end to the other, to declare that far be it from God, that he ſhould

do

do wickedneſs; and from the Almighty, that he ſhould commit iniquity; for the work of a man ſhall he render unto him, and cauſe every man to find according to his ways? That the judge of all the earth will do what is right? That he will render to every man according to what he has done, whether it be good or evil? That with righteouſneſs ſhall he judge the world, and the people with equity? That God made not death, neither has he pleaſure in the deſtruction of the living? And if this were not the whole tenour of Scripture, yet is it not undeniable, that the particular texts which ſpeak after this manner, are infinitely clearer and plainer, and leſs poſſible to be miſapplied than thoſe which are imagined to look the contrary way? Does not God ſwear by himſelf; As I live, ſaith the Lord, I have no pleaſure in the death of him that dieth, but rather that he ſhould turn from his ways and live? Does not the Apoſtle St. Peter declare, that God is not willing that any periſh, but that all ſhould come to repentance? And St. Paul, that God would have all men to be ſaved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth? And is it not fit that theſe plain texts which

cannot be miſtaken, ſhould be the rule by which the obſcurer ones are to be interpreted, rather than that the obſcurer places ſhould cauſe the plain ones to be perverted or neglected? And yet indeed even the obſcure ones are not ſo much ſo in themſelves, as by our want of attending to their true meaning. The ninth chapter of the epiſtle to the Romans, which has ſometimes perplexed the minds of well meaning perſons, was by all Chriſtians in the firſt ages without difficulty; and is now again by all rational men, who attend to the ſcope of the Apoſtle's argument, more than to the ſchemes of men's own inventing, clearly underſtood to be written, not concerning God's chuſing ſome particular perſons, and rejecting others from eternal ſalvation, but concerning his rejecting the nation of the Jews, and receiving in the Gentiles to be partakers of the benefits of the Goſpel: and the Elect there ſpoken of, are the whole Chriſtian Church, whereof all nevertheleſs do not attain unto ſalvation; and the reprobate there mentioned, are the whole nation of the unbelieving Jews, whereof all nevertheleſs were not finally caſt off: And where God's fore-determination

of

of particular perſons is ſpoken of, it is not a fore-appointment to eternal happineſs or miſery, but always to ſome temporal office or advantage only. Thus of Jacob and Eſau it was determined, before either of them was born, or had done either good or evil, that the purpoſe of God according to election might ſtand, it was determined, what? only that the elder ſhould be ſervant to the younger. And when it was fore-appointed that our Saviour ſhould be betrayed, it was likewiſe fore-appointed, not that Judas ſhould betray him, but that our Lord ſhould chuſe on purpoſe into the number of his Apoſtles one ſuch perſon as Judas, whoſe own wickedneſs he ſaw would make him a proper inſtrument of accompliſhing that deſign. And when St. Paul aſks, Who maketh thee to differ from another? he does not ſpeak of moral diſpoſitions, but of miraculous qualifications for offices and dignities in the Church; as is evident from the context. And when God hardened Pharaoh's heart, it was not that God originally made him wicked, but his own obſtinate wickedneſs made him worthy to be judicially hardened,

ened, and a fit perſon to be raiſed up by providence, for the manifeſtation of God's glory in his exemplary deſtruction." S. Clarke, Serm. clxxii.

The Pelagians were charged with holding that man was able to perform a perfect obedience. This was a nice point in the controverſy; and the Pelagians reaſoned about it thus:

When a man commits a ſin, it is by his own fault, elſe he would contract no guilt, and deſerve no puniſhment. He might therefore have abſtained from it by his own natural powers, or by the aſſiſtance of God, which would have been granted to him if he had qualified himſelf to receive it. If this be ſo, of any ſin, and of each ſin, it muſt hold true of all the ſins which a man commits; and he might have avoided them.

Therefore it is naturally poſſible that a man may live without ſin; but yet, morally ſpeaking, all circumſtances being conſidered, it is impoſſible for a man to offend in no inſtance; and it is a certain fact, that there never

never was a man who performed an unſinning obedience, except Jeſus Chriſt.

Such was the doctrine of the Pelagians; and thus in the doctrine of chances, there are events which are barely poſſible, but improbable to ſuch a degree, that it may be preſumed they would not happen once in ten thouſand experiments repeated for ten thouſand years together.

"TOWARDS [d] the latter part of the fourth century, an infinite number of people uſed to go and viſit the holy places in Paleſtine, and this cauſed the works of Origen to be known in the weſt. Amongſt others, Rufinus a Preſbyter of Aquileia, after having

[d] "I drew up this *abridgment* of the hiſtory of Pelagius, whilſt I was giving an extract of biſhop Uſher's book. The works of Cardinal Noris, Garnier, and Pagi might be ſerviceable to correct many things in that Hiſtory of Uſher, particularly, as to the chronology, which was not ſufficiently cleared up in his days." *Le Clerc.* Bibl. Choiſ. viii. 308.

I have here *abridged* this *abridgment* of Le Clerc, leaving out ſome of the theological part of it, and confining myſelf chiefly to the hiſtorical points, and adding ſeveral remarks of my own.

ſpent

ſpent thirty years in the eaſt, and ſtudied under Evagrius an Origeniſt, not only imbibed the ſentiments of Origen, but returning into Italy, ſpread them every where by tranſlating divers books of this father. It was from Rufinus that Pelagius and Cæleſtius learned at Rome thoſe doctrines for which they were afterwards condemned. They were both of them Monks of Great Britain, Cæleſtius of Scotland, and Pelagius of England. The ſecond was called [e] *Morgan*, i. e. *ſea-born*, in Greek, Πελάγιος, which name he went by in foreign countries. If we may believe Jerom, Pelagius was a blockhead, who knew not how to expreſs himſelf, and more worthy of pity than of envy, and Cæleſtius was a maker of ſolœciſms and a blunderer. But Auguſtin ſpeaks of their abilities with eſteem; and indeed from the fragments of their works we may ſee that they were not ſuch dunces as Jerom repreſents them.

Pelagius ſtayed a conſiderable time at Rome, where he acquired a great reputation by his works, and by his conduct; ſo that

[e] See Colomeſii Opuſcula, cap. 29.

Auguſtin,

Auguſtin, biſhop of Hippo, highly commended him, and wrote him a very obliging letter before the quarrel between them had commenced.

Rome being taken by the Goths, Pelagius departed thence to go into the eaſt, and ſtopped at Afric, but made no ſtay there. His diſciple Cæleſtius remained at Carthage, and deſired to be admitted a Preſbyter of that Church; but as he made no ſcruple to maintain the ſentiments of his maſter, he was accuſed by Paulinus, Deacon of the church, at a council in which Aurelius, biſhop of Carthage, preſided, A. D. 412. Cæleſtius was there condemned, and excommunicated, as having maintained ſome propoſitions, relating to original ſin and to human liberty, which were injurious to the grace of God. Cæleſtius gave an anſwer to the objections; but we have only fragments of his reply, in the books of Auguſtin; that is to ſay, we have no other witneſſes of his doctrine than his adverſaries, who took no care to propoſe their own objections clearly, or to comprehend the ſentiments of thoſe whom they accuſed. Cæleſtius ſaid, amongſt other things,

things, that as to the propagation of ſin, he had heard it denied by ſeveral Catholic Preſbyters, and particularly by Rufinus. He preſented a petition to the council, in which he acknowledged that infants were redeemed by baptiſm. But notwithſtanding this, he was condemned and obliged to depart from Afric; and he withdrew to Sicily, where he wrote ſome treatiſes in his own defence. From Sicily were ſent to St. Auguſtin ſome ſhort queſtions which Cæleſtius had drawn up, to prove that man is not by his nature irreſiſtibly impelled to do evil. Theſe queries are contained in fourteen articles, which Uſher hath ſet down.

At the ſame time Pelagius, who was at Jeruſalem, publiſhed ſeveral tracts, in which he explained his ſentiments more fully. St. Auguſtin undertook to refute one of theſe treatiſes, in his book *of nature and grace.*

Three years after the condemnation of Cæleſtius at Carthage, his maſter Pelagius was accuſed at Jeruſalem of holding the ſame ſentiments, and John, Biſhop of that city, ſummoned an aſſembly to examine him. That they might know what had been done

in Afric againſt Cæleſtius, three Latin Preſbyters, Avitus, Vitalis, and Oroſius were called to the aſſembly. The latter was then at Bethlehem, ſtudying, as he ſays, at the feet of St. Jerom, to whom St. Auguſtin had recommended him. As he had been preſent in Afric at the time when Cæleſtius was condemned, he related to the aſſembly with what zeal the Carthaginian ſynod had proceeded againſt that heretic, and he added, that St. Auguſtin had written a book againſt Pelagius, and had alſo, in a letter ſent to Sicily, refuted the queſtions of Cæleſtius. This letter he produced, and read it to the company; and then John deſired that Pelagius might be introduced. This was permitted (ſays Oroſius) either out of reſpect to that Biſhop, or becauſe it was thought proper that this Prelate ſhould confute him to his face. Pelagius was aſked whether he acknowledged that he had taught doctrines which Auguſtin Biſhop of Hippo had confuted. He inſtantly replied, *and who is this Auguſtin?* Upon which (ſays Oroſius) all cried out that a man who blaſphemed againſt a Biſhop, by whoſe mouth the Lord had preſerved union in Afric, deſerved to be baniſhed not only from

from that aſſembly, but from the whole Church. Yet John made him ſit down amongſt the Catholic Preſbyters, though a lay-man and guilty of hereſy; and then ſaid to him, *I am Auguſtin*; to the end that acting in the name of that biſhop, he might the more freely forgive Pelagius, and ſoften the irritated aſſembly. We all made anſwer (ſays Oroſius) *If you repreſent here the perſon of Auguſtin, follow his ſentiments.*

The [f] council of Dioſpolis having examined Pelagius, A. D. 415, and heard and approved his anſwers, declared him worthy of the communion of the Catholic Church. His enemies accuſed him of having concealed his true ſentiments, and impoſed upon the Greek clergy; and St. Auguſtin ſays, that the anſwers of Pelagius were orthodox, as the fathers of the council underſtood them, and not in the ſenſe of Pelagius. But they who have not ſo bad an opinion of Pelagius, obſerve that St. Auguſtin, who was ignorant of the Greek language, might alſo be miſtaken him-

[f] Jerom calls them *a pitiful aſſembly*, for ſuffering themſelves to be over-reached by Pelagius: But they ſeem to me to have been prudent and moderate men.

ſelf

ſelf, and could not poſſibly know what the Greek Church held concerning this ſubject. If he had been able to read the Greek fathers, ſay they, he would have found that they ſpake exactly like Pelagius, as it may be proved by innumerable paſſages of St. Chryſoſtom, and his diſciple St. Iſidorus, whom ſome moderns have openly accuſed of Pelagianiſm. It is not therefore ſtrange that the Greek biſhops approved the expreſſions of the Engliſh Monk.

Before the acts of this council were publiſhed, Pelagius wrote to one of his friends, informing him that his ſentiments had been approved by it, and publiſhed this letter. He alſo drew up a kind of apology for the council, A. D. 416, and ſent it to the Biſhop of Hippo, who having received no other letter from Palæſtine, would not truſt to it. With ſome other African Biſhops, he wrote to John of Jeruſalem, to have the very acts of the council of Dioſpolis. In the mean time St. Jerom, who had written againſt the Pelagians, and particularly againſt the Biſhop of Jeruſalem, occaſioned a diſorder which happened at Bethlehem, in

which a Deacon was killed, and ſome Monaſteries were burnt. The Biſhop was accuſed of having excited this tumult; but they had not time to make him give an account of it, for he died in that year. St. Jerom, who had offended the Biſhops of Palæſtine, by deſpiſing their aſſembly, thought it expedient to [g] wheedle the African Biſhops, and make them his friends, though he was not altogether in their way of thinking, but held the opinions of the Semipelagians. Therefore he wrote to St. Auguſtin in theſe terms; *I am reſolved to love you, to honour you, to reverence and admire you, and to defend your ſayings as though they were my own.*

Pelagius was every where accuſed of denying altogether the aſſiſtance of grace. To juſtify himſelf he wrote a book on free-will, in which he acknowledged ſix kinds of grace, one kind of which is thus repreſented by him; *I hold that grace conſiſts not only in the law of God, but in the aſſiſtance of God. He aſſiſts us by his doctrine and reve-*

[g] Though, to do him juſtice, he was uſually more given to biting than to fawning.

lation, by opening the eyes of the mind, by ſhewing us things future, that the things preſent may not have dominion over us, by diſcovering to us the ſnares of the Devil, and by illuminating us with divers and ineffable gifts of his heavenly grace. Can you imagine, adds Pelagius, *that they who ſpeak thus are deniers of grace? Do they not rather acknowledge at the ſame time both human liberty and divine grace?*

St. Auguſtin on this occaſion accuſes Pelagius not of having abſolutely denied grace, but of having denied the neceſſity of it, and of having ſaid, that God gave it only to enable free agents to purſue good with more facility. This grace, indeed, according to Pelagius, did not infallibly and of itſelf produce a will to do right; it only made the performance of our dut morey eaſy to us.

Never was there a diſpute more embarraſſed than this; becauſe each party, being preſſed by ſome troubleſome conſequence, endeavoured to ſhun the difficulty, by uſing terms to which they gave a ſenſe different from that which their adverſaries aſcribed to

the ſame words. Thus the word *grace* did not ſignify the ſame thing with Pelagius, as with the Biſhop of Hippo; and the latter gave the name of *liberty* to that which is not uſually ſo called. In ſhort, many are of opinion that if we carefully examine the words which have been moſt uſed in this controverſy, and the ideas which have been annexed to them, we ſhall hardly find one of theſe ideas to be clear and diſtinct. Some words, according to them, will be found, which have abſolutely no [h] meaning at all: ſo that in ſome parts of this diſpute, the contenders might be compared to a Frenchman and an Arabian, each of them knowing only his mother-tongue, who ſhould bawl in their turns as loud as they were able, and ſometimes both at once, without underſtanding one another, and then boaſt that they had confuted their [i] adverſary.

[h] One of the School-men, whoſe name was Suicet, and who paſſed for a very ſubtile diſputant, when he was old, uſed to weep, becauſe he did not underſtand what he had compoſed in the days of his youth. Hence ariſes a queſtion, whether Suicet's intellects were improved or impaired by old age?

[i] It is all one to go about to draw thoſe men out of their miſtakes, who have no ſettled notions, as to diſ-

The

The year after the council of Dioſpolis, two councils were held in Afric concerning this affair, one at Carthage, the other at Milevum. Aurelius, Biſhop of Carthage, preſided at the firſt, where ſixty ſeven Biſhops were aſſembled. They had not yet received in Afric the acts of Dioſpolis; but Eros and Lazarus had written them an account of theſe tranſactions, and had ſent their letter by Oroſius. Upon this report it was reſolved to anathematize the opinions of Pelagius, leſt they ſhould ſpread; and then to anathematize both him and his diſciple Cæleſtius, if they would not clearly condemn thoſe errors. After this, they tranſmitted the acts of their council to Pope Innocent, to engage him to condemn theſe opinions. The council of Milevum, conſiſting of ſixty one Biſhops, concurred with their brethren of Carthage. Beſides the Synodal letters of theſe two Councils, Innocent received private ones from ſome African Biſhops, and from St. Auguſtin. The drift of all theſe letters was to induce the Pope to

poſſeſs a vagrant of his habitation, who has no ſettled abode. Locke on Hum. underſt.

condemn the doctrine aſcribed to Pelagius, and to cite him alſo, to know whether he perſiſted in his errors; and therefore they inſinuated, that Pelagius had deceived the Biſhops of Palæſtine, though they were afraid of affirming it poſitively, leſt they ſhould ſet the African and the Eaſtern Churches at variance. Innocent, in the year following, ſent an anſwer to the Councils and to the private letters. He ſaid that, in his opinion, Pelagius and Cæleſtius deſerved to be excommunicated, and that the firſt could not have cleared himſelf at Dioſpolis, unleſs by ambiguous expreſſions and equivocations: but he added, that as he had not yet received any certain accounts from thoſe parts, or knew how things had been tranſacted, he could not either approve or diſapprove the conduct of the Biſhops of Palæſtine. He alſo excuſed himſelf, as to the citing of Pelagius, on account of the diſtance of place. Innocent wrote theſe anſwers in the beginning of the year, and died ſoon after.

After his death, St. Auguſtin and Alypius wrote to St. Paulinus, Biſhop of Nola, exhorting him to oppoſe Pelagianiſm in Italy,

Italy, if there was danger of its making any progreſs there.

In the mean time Cæleſtius came and preſented himſelf, of his own accord, to Zoſimus, who ſucceeded Innocent, and offered to him a ſmall treatiſe, in which he explained his own belief.

In it he went through all the articles of Faith, from the Trinity to the Reſurrection of the dead, and declared, that in all theſe points he held the opinions of the Catholic Church. To this he added, that if diſputes had ariſen concerning other ſubjects which were not articles of faith, he for his part had never aſſumed an authority to make them neceſſary doctrines, but rather choſe to offer to the judgment and examination of Zoſimus what he had collected concerning them from the Prophets and Apoſtles, that he might correct his own errors, if he was fallen into any. Laſtly, he explained his notions concerning the controverted points, and he expreſsly denied that men were born ſinners.

Zoſimus cited Cæleſtius to appear before him in the Church of St. Clemens,

where he ordered this writing to be read, and then aſked the author, whether he believed what was contained in it. Cæleſtius affirmed it; and then Zoſimus propoſed ſome queſtions to him, which amounted to theſe; whether he condemned the doctrines which Paulinus, Deacon of Carthage, had laid to his charge? He anſwered, that he could prove Paulinus to be an heretic, and that he would not condemn thoſe doctrines of which he had been accuſed by him. The other queſtion was, Whether he would condemn what Pope Innocent had condemned, and would follow the ſentiments of the Church of Rome? He anſwered that he would.

After theſe formalities, Zoſimus wrote to the African Biſhops a long letter, in which he relates to them how Cæleſtius had appeared before him, and how he had been examined; he then reproaches them for having acted in this affair with too much precipitation, and for having too lightly believed idle rumours, and certain letters of [k] Eros

[k] Zoſimus tells Lazarus, that he was an old calumniator, who had been condemned by Proculus, Biſhop of Marſeille, in a Synod, becauſe he had falſely and

and

and Lazarus, without ſufficient evidence of their integrity. He, in concluſion, cites the accuſers of Cæleſtius to appear at Rome within two months. Yet he thought it not proper to take off the excommunication which the African Biſhops had pronounced againſt Cæleſtius.

As in thoſe days the judgment of a Synod, and even of a ſingle Biſhop, particularly a Biſhop of Rome, was of great weight, howſoever it had been obtained, and as Zoſimus was afterwards accuſed of prevarication in condemning Pelagius, whoſe doctrine he had before approved and juſtified, St. Auguſtin endeavoured to give the beſt turn he could to the conduct of Zoſimus, as if this Prelate had ſhewed himſelf favourable to Cæleſtius out of mere pity, and in [1] hopes

maliciouſly accuſed Britius, Biſhop of Tours; and that after this, being ordained Biſhop of Aix by the favour of the tyrant and uſurper Conſtantine, he had held the ſhadow of Epiſcopacy whilſt the power of that tyrant continued; and as to Eros, he reproaches him for having followed the ſame party, and committed acts of violence. Du Pin.

[1] In homine acerrimi ingenii, qui profecto, ſi corrigeretur, plurimis profuiſſet, voluntas emendationis, non falſitas dogmatis approbata eſt.

that

that ſince Cæleſtius had not dogmatized, but propoſed his opinions as points on which he wiſhed to be inſtructed, it might not be difficult to bring him to a better mind. But, ſays Uſher, the learned Voſſius hath ſhewed long ago, that this great Biſhop laboured in vain to juſtify Zoſimus and to conceal his faults. From the letters which he wrote to the African Biſhops it is manifeſt that he conſidered Cæleſtius and Pelagius as men who had not departed from the Catholic faith.

Zoſimus having ſent his letter to Afric, received a packet from Palæſtine directed to Innocent, whoſe death was not known there. It contained ſome letters from Praylus Biſhop of Jeruſalem, and an apology of Pelagius, and a ſmall treatiſe, in which he explained his ſentiments very clearly. The Biſhop of Jeruſalem openly eſpouſed the cauſe of Pelagius. Zoſimus ordered theſe letters and writings to be publickly read; and they were generally approved, as he ſoon after informed the African Biſhops: *Would to God* (ſaid he) *my deareſt brethren, that ſome of you had been preſent at the reading of*

of theſe letters! how great was the joy of the holy men who heard them! how much were they admired by every one! Scarcely could ſome of the aſſembly refrain from tears. Is it poſſible that men whoſe faith is ſo pure ſhould have been ſo calumniated? Is there any part of their writings in which they do not mention the divine grace and the divine aſſiſtance?

Beſides this he condemned in his letter Eros and Lazarus, the accuſers of Pelagius and Cæleſtius, as men guilty of great crimes, *erubeſcenda factis et damnationibus nomina*, and ſpake with much contempt of the reſt of their proſecutors.

Yet the African Biſhops had no regard to theſe remonſtrances. They aſſembled again at Carthage, in number two hundred and fourteen, and again condemned Pelagius and Cæleſtius, till they ſhould admit the neceſſity of grace in the ſame ſenſe in which it was maintained in Afric, without recourſe to their uſual ſhufflings and evaſions.

This aſſembly was held in the year 418, and ſent its conſtitutions, together with a letter, to Zoſimus, in which theſe Biſhops exhort

exhort him to proceed againſt Pelagius according to their determinations. Their letter had the effect which they deſired; and Zoſimus with all his Clergy, who once had ſo highly admired the writings of Pelagius in which he had ſo clearly ſet forth his opinions, yet *now* (as St. Auguſtin relates it) *giving attention to what was believed concerning it by the Romans, whoſe faith is to be praiſed in the Lord, found that their ſentiments were unanimous and zealous for the Catholic Truth againſt the errors of Pelagius.* However Zoſimus, when he condemned him, did not ſpeak with the ſame warmth which he had ſhewed when he decided in his favour, as may be ſeen in Uſher.

The Emperors Honorius and Theodoſius received alſo the acts of the African Council, and thought themſelves obliged to ſtrengthen them by their authority. They made an Edict, which they ſent to the three *Præfects* of the *Prætorium*, to be publiſhed throughout the Empire, by which they baniſhed Pelagius and Cæleſtius from Rome, and condemned to perpetual exile and confiſcation of eſtates all who ſhould maintain

their doctrines in any place, and they authorized all perſons to inform againſt them and accuſe them.

The Præfects accompanied this Imperial law with Edicts of their own, one of which is ſtill extant and runs thus:

[1] IF he, who is fallen into the infamous ſentiments of this obſcure hereſy, be a Laic or an Eccleſiaſtic, and any one drag him before the judge, no exceptions to the perſon and character of the accuſer ſhall be admitted, and the accuſed ſhall be ſtripped of all his poſſeſſions, and ſent into perpetual baniſhment.

[1] *Et ſi ſit ille Plebeius ac Clericus, qui in caliginis hujus obſcæna reciderit, a quocunque tractus ad judicem, ſine accuſatricis diſcretione perſonæ, facultatum publicatione nudatus, irrevocabile patietur exilium.*

According to this righteous Law, the teſtimony of one perſon, and any perſon, of an ideot, a lunatic, a cut-purſe, a knight of the poſt, was ſufficient to convict and condemn a man of Pelagianiſm! One would think that the Emperors of thoſe times had ſworn to extinguiſh the Roman Spirit, and the Chriſtian Spirit, and to turn all their ſubjects into ſpies, informers, bigots, fanatics, and perſecutors.

Some

Some will be inclined to ſuſpect that this Edict, conceived in terms ſo emphatical, muſt have been penned by ſome zealous Eccleſiaſtic; but this is nothing in compariſon with the Imperial laws of Honorius and Theodoſius, which may be ſeen in Uſher. They who are acquainted with the ſtyle of the Preachers in thoſe days, will eaſily believe that a man muſt have been long accuſtomed to ſuch compoſitions, before he could have prefaced an Imperial Edict in theſe terms, which I ſhall not attempt to tranſlate:

Ad conturbandam Catholicæ ſimplicitatis lucem, puro ſemper ſplendore radiantem, doloſæ artis ingenio, novam ſubito emicuiſſe verſutiam, pervulgatâ opinione cognovimus: quæ fallacis ſcientiæ obumbrata mendaciis, et furiato tantum debacchata luctamine, ſtabilem quietem cæleſtis conatur attrectare fidei; dum novi acuminis commendata vento, inſignem notam plebeiæ æſtimat vilitatis ſentire cum cunctis, ac prudentiæ ſingularis palmam fore, communiter approbata deſtruere, &c.

[Let us try however what a figure it will make in Engliſh.

WE

WE have been informed from common report, that, to diſturb by the wit of deceitful artifice the light of Catholic ſimplicity, ever glittering with the pureſt ſplendor, a new ſubtility hath ſuddenly ſtarted forth, which, clouded with the lies of fallacious ſcience, and only bluſtering with frantic ſtruggles, attempts to lay rude hands on the ſtable quiet of heavenly faith; whilſt recommended to [*or* by] the wind of new acuteneſs, it accounts it a mark of plebeian meanneſs to think with the Many, and a trophy of ſingular prudence to deſtroy whatſoever enjoys the general approbation, &c.

Dark and uncouth as this is, yet we may diſcover in it the drift of the Legiſlator, or rather of his ſecretary, which was firſt to compoſe a moſt elegant preamble, and ſecondly to throw dirt on a perſecuted ſect, and to make it odious. Though he could hardly be guilty of reading Cicero, he ſeems ſome way other to have purloined a precept laid down by the Orator: *Qui ſemel verecundiæ fines tranſierit, eum bene et naviter oportet eſſe impudentem. He who hath bid adieu*

adieu to modeſty, ought to be impudent to ſome purpoſe.

Hard was the fate of the Pelagians, to be inſulted and cruſhed by ſuch adverſaries, who, though in their own conceits they were veſſels of holineſs, filled with ſpiritual gifts and graces, yet certainly had not the gift of good ſenſe, or the graces of candour and moderation !]

The reſt is in the ſame ſtyle, and from this edict we may learn, that the ſpiritual methods for the converſion of heretics in the days of Honorius were not very different from thoſe which have been uſed in theſe later ages.

In the mean time the African Biſhops who had juſt condemned Pelagius, as yet not knowing any thing of the Imperial edict which was dated the laſt of April, aſſembled on the day following, at Carthage, and condemned as Pelagian hereſies, eight propoſitions, of which ſome had never been adopted by the Pelagians. But it hath been always the cuſtom of councils, whilſt they condemned the real opinions of heretics, to anathe-

anathematize alſo errors which no [m] man alive ever maintained: and this was done, perhaps, to inſpire and excite a greater horror for hereſy, and to deter men from the raſh and dangerous attempt of protecting the perſons of heretics. Thus as St. Auguſtin expreſſes it, *by the vigilance of epiſcopal councils, and by the ſuccour of our Lord and Saviour who defends his church* [he ſhould have added, *and by the powerful aid of Imperial Edicts*] *Pelagius and Cæleſtius were condemned by all the Chriſtian world, unleſs they ſhould repent.*

But Pelagius, who was ſtill at Jeruſalem, being preſſed by Pinianus and Melania, publiſhed a declaration concerning grace, which he acknowledged to be neceſſary for every action, and at every moment. He ſaid alſo that he held the ſame opinion concerning baptiſm which he had delivered in his profeſſion of faith to Pope Innocent, namely, that children ought to be baptized, as it had been practiſed in the Church. But whatſoever he might ſay, none believed that

[m] Our Eccleſiaſtical judges uſed the Lollards in the ſame manner. Burnet, hiſt. of the Reform. V. i. p. 29.

he meant it in the ſenſe of the African Church.

At this time Julian, an Italian Biſhop, publiſhed, beſides other treatiſes, four books againſt the firſt of St. Auguſtin *De concupiſcentia et nuptiis*, in which he maintained the ſentiments of Pelagius, and openly declared the African Biſhops to be ſeditious innovators, and ſaid that certainly they could not have [n] reaſon on their ſide, ſince inſtead of uſing arguments they had recourſe to violence, and terrified their opponents by Imperial Edicts, which might ſilence the timorous, but could never ſatisfy the wiſe. He accuſed Zoſimus of prevarication, in condemning Pelagius after he had approved his doctrines. As to the African Synods, he obſerved that they who had been condemned there had not been permitted to ſpeak for themſelves; that no man can be a proper judge of controverted points, unleſs he bring with him a mind free from pride, prejudice, affection, ſelf intereſt, wrath and hatred;

[n] —— laborare illam partem rationis inopiâ, quæ in differendo cum terrorem ſurrogat, nullum a prudentibus impetrat, ſed cæcum a meticuloſis extorquet aſſenſum.

that

that the African Prelates could not be impartial judges, becauſe they had conceived a deteſtation for the ſentiments of Pelagius, even before they knew any thing concerning them; and that votes ought not to be counted, but weighed. In ſhort, he produced all the objections which are uſually made to the *decrees* of *Councils*.

Another aſſembly was held at Carthage, A. D. 419, conſiſting of two hundred and ſeventeen Biſhops, who ratified all that the former Synods had done againſt Pelagius. And indeed, to uſe the words of St. Proſper, How could it poſſibly be otherwiſe, where Aurelius was the preſident, and Auguſtin the director?

Anne alium in finem potuit procedere ſanctum Concilium, cui dux Aurelius, ingeniumque Auguſtinus erat?

But the Epiſcopal authority was again inforced on this occaſion by the power of the Emperors, who in a letter to Aurelius, confirmed their former edict, and ordered that if any one knew in what place of the empire Pelagius and Cæleſtius were lurking, and ſhould not diſcover them, or inſtantly drive

them out, he ſhould ſuffer the ſame puniſhments as were appointed for heretics. And to chaſtize the obſtinacy of ſome biſhops who connived at the maintainers of this hereſy, or who did not openly attack it, Aurelius was commanded to ſee that they who would not ſign the condemnation of Pelagianiſm, ſhould be depoſed, excommunicated, and baniſhed, and to publiſh this edict throughout Afric. Theſe orders he executed punctually, ſending with the edict a circular letter to the Biſhops, and exhorting all who had, or who had not been preſent at the laſt council, to ſign its decrees. The Biſhops who were in the ſentiments of Pelagius ſigned them with great reluctance, and eighteen of them wrote to the Biſhop of Theſſalonica, to try whether they could gain over the eaſtern prelates to their ſide. To engage them the more eaſily, they accuſed their adverſaries of Manichæiſm, becauſe the Manichæans alſo held the inevitable neceſſity of ſinning, and the natural corruption of man. This accuſation was the more odious, as St. Auguſtin their chief adverſary, in his youth had been infected with the Manichæan notions, and then had abjured them, and oppoſed

oppoſed them on the very ſame principles which were held by the Pelagians, principles which he once admitted, and now rejected and anathematized ſince he had been made a Biſhop.

On the other hand, Julian wrote to Rome, and Cæleſtius went to Conſtantinople A. D. 419, to try if he could get friends there. But after the Imperial Edicts which have been mentioned, there was ſmall hope of ſucceſs. Cæleſtius was ill received by Atticus the Biſhop. The Pelagians were alſo ill uſed at Epheſus and Sicily, as St. Proſper tells us, and Conſtantius, whom Honorius had adopted as partner in the Empire, publiſhed an Edict againſt thoſe who ſhould conceal Cæleſtius, A. D. 420.

St. Jerom died this year, and St. Auguſtin compoſed his four books addreſſed to Bonifacius who ſucceeded Zoſimus, and ſix againſt Julian, addreſſed to Claudius. In theſe he extols St. Jerom, and affirms that he was in the ſame ſentiments with the African Biſhops: but St. Jerom, though he had indeed attacked the Pelagians, yet had em-

ployed [o] neither the arguments nor the principles of St. Auguſtin.

Whilſt Pelagius [p] lay concealed in the Eaſt, and held his peace, Julian wrote eight books againſt the ſecond of Auguſtin *De concupiſcentia et nuptiis*, having refuted the firſt in the four books which have been mentioned. St. Auguſtin, who had anſwered the firſt work of Julian, undertook to anſwer the ſecond, but died before he had finiſhed his reply.

Julian gave a full ſcope to his reſentment in theſe books, and ſeems to have deſigned, by inſulting the adverſaries of Pelagius, to

[o] Jerom was for human liberty as well as the Pelagians, and acted an unhandſome and diſingenuous part when he joined himſelf to their perſecutors who were Fataliſts.

[p] The miſerable Pelagius hid himſelf in ſome hole, and paſſed the reſt of his days, like an owl or a bat, in obſcurity, and probably never returned more to his native land. He was condemned by men who did not underſtand his meaning, as Stillingfleet candidly obſerves in his *Origines Britannicæ*. Molina, a Spaniſh Jeſuit, and his diſciples, uſed to ſay, that if the fathers who oppoſed Pelagius, had conſidered what they were doing, and if Pelagius had defended himſelf in a proper manner, they never would have condemned him. Enriquez.

revenge

revenge himſelf of the cruel Edicts which they had obtained againſt the Pelagians. But he fared the worſe for it, and Cæleſtinus Biſhop of Rome baniſhed him from Italy with all the Prelates who were of that party.

Yet it appears that Pelagianiſm ſpread itſelf, under all theſe difficulties, ſince the Emperor Valentinian thought it neceſſary to purge Gaul of this hereſy, by an Edict, A.D. 425, in which he commanded Patroclus Biſhop of Arles to viſit ſeveral Biſhops who followed the ſentiments of Pelagius, and to declare to them that, if within twenty days they did not retract their errors, they ſhould be baniſhed from Gaul, and deprived of their Biſhopricks.

Joannes Caſſianus, who had been Deacon to St. Chryſoſtom, and ordained Preſbyter by Innocent I, retiring to Marſeilles, wrote ſome treatiſes, in which having ſoftened the ſentiments of Pelagius, whom in other reſpects he condemned as an heretic, he gave birth to a doctrine which hath ſince been called Semipelagianiſm.

The difference between the Pelagians and the Semipelagians ſeems to have been only this, that the latter acknowledged a natural corruption of man in ſome degree, and inſiſted more upon the neceſſity of grace, at leaſt in words.

Yet they anathematized Pelagius, upon the ſuppoſition perhaps that he adopted all thoſe opinions which the African Councils had condemned, and laid to his charge.

The notions of St. Auguſtin, oppoſed to thoſe of the Pelagians and Semipelagians, may be found in his books of *predeſtination* and *perſeverance*, and in the writings of St. Proſper.

In the year 429, one Agricola, the ſon of a Pelagian Biſhop, carried Pelagianiſm into England. But St. Germanus, Biſhop of Auxerre, was ſent thither by Pope Cæleſtinus, or by the Biſhops of Gaul, to extirpate this hereſy. Many miracles are ſaid to have been wrought by him in his voyage, and during his abode in England, which may be found in Biſhop Uſher. But if what

what Hector Boetius relates, in his hiſtory of the Scots, be true, Germanus made uſe of a method which is not leſs efficacious for the deſtruction of hereſy, and *the Pelagians who would not retract their errors, were burnt by the care and order of the magiſtrates.*

[Le Clerc hath paſſed over the wonderful works of Germanus; but, I think, they deſerve to be laid before the reader, as an important ſpecimen of the miracles of the fifth century.

As Germanus was ſailing to Britain, an horrible tempeſt aroſe, raiſed by the Devil, as it afterwards plainly appeared. The Saint was faſt aſleep in the ſhip, but being rouſed by the cries of the periſhing crew, he rebuked the ſtorm, and in the name of the Trinity, ſprinkled a few drops of holy oil upon the raging waves, and inſtantly there was a great calm.

A multitude of Britains were aſſembled together, expecting his arrival, for the Devils had foretold his coming; and when he afterwards caſt them out of Dæmoniacs, they

they honeſtly owned that it was they who raiſed the ſtorm.

When he landed, he diſputed with the Pelagians, and by a torrent of eloquence, and the irreſiſtible dint of demonſtration, he ſo confuted them, that they had not one word to ſay for themſelves, good or bad; inſomuch that the populace was hardly reſtrained from aſſaulting theſe ſtubborn heretics, and beating their ſtupid brains out.

A man of quality had a blind daughter, and Germanus, calling on the Trinity, touched her eyes with ſome Reliques which he had in a box, and inſtantly ſhe received her ſight. Germanus put theſe Reliques into the tomb of St. Alban, for the benefit of the Engliſh, and in lieu of them, took away what was as good, namely, a bit of earth where the blood of Alban had been ſhed.

The Picts and Saxons at that time invaded England; but Germanus put himſelf at the head of the Britains, and procured a miraculous victory. Though he had grace irreſiſtible and preternatural powers on his ſide, yet

yet he thought it proper not to neglect the art military: he ſent forth ſcouts to *reconnoitre* the enemy, and to know the nature of the ground, and he poſted himſelf to the beſt advantage, and played the part of the Saint and of the ſoldier;

Ἀμφότερον, ἱερεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς, κραιπνός τ' ἀιχμητής.

In his return homewards he ſprained his foot, and whilſt he was confined in bed, a fire brake out, which burnt all the adjacent buildings, but had no power to hurt the Saint, or even the houſe where he lay. S. Baſnage relates theſe Calviniſtical miracles, as a man ſomewhat inclined to believe them. *Ann.* iii. 328.

Germanus made a ſecond viſit to Britain, A. D. 446, to fight the Pelagians once more, and performed a multitude of miracles, and even raiſed the dead. He continued the trade of a wonder-worker to the end of his days. Fleury, H. E. T. vi.

And yet, which is very ſtrange, Germanus himſelf is ſuſpected of having been a Semipelagian, and was intimate with Hilary of Arles, who was infected with thoſe notions. Stillingfleet, *Orig. Brit.*]

But whilſt St. German was purging and purifying England, the ſeeds of Pelagianiſm were ſprouting up in France, which had been ſowed by Caſſianus amongſt the Monks of Marſeilles, and in *Gallia Narbonenſis*. St. Proſper and Hilary had written to St. Auguſtin about it, and had informed him that many Eccleſiaſticks in Gaul accounted his ſentiments to be dangerous innovations. St. Auguſtin had anſwered their objections in the Books wich have been mentioned; but the Semipelagians, being protected by Hilary biſhop of Riez, were unmoleſted, although they declared a great diſlike of the doctrine of St. Auguſtin.

Julian and the other Biſhops, who, as we obſerved, were expelled from Italy, repaired to Conſtantinople, where they importuned the Emperor that they might be reeſtabliſhed: but as they had been accuſed of hereſy, he would grant them nothing, without firſt knowing the reaſons for which they had been baniſhed. Neſtorius, Biſhop of Conſtantinople, wrote concerning this affair to Pope Cæleſtinus, who ſent him a rude anſwer, telling him that it was no concern

cern of his to inquire into the cauſes for which theſe Biſhops had been condemned, and reproaching him at the ſame time for his own heterodoxies.

[Julian, for defending free-will and conditional decrees in oppoſition to the African innovations, was anathematized, baniſhed, depoſed, and driven about from place to place, a vagabond and a fugitive. His declaring his ſentiments ſo freely on theſe points, at the expenſe of his preferment, reputation and repoſe, and againſt all his temporal intereſts, creates a favourable prejudice in his behalf. He was an Italian, and the ſon of a Biſhop, and in his youth he married a lady of a conſular family. His wife, it is thought, was dead before theſe calamities fell upon him, and he might have ſaid, with old Evander,

Tuque, o ſanctiſſima conjux,
Felix morte tua, neque in hunc ſervata dolorem!

The friendly hand of Death removed this Biſhop beyond the reach of his inexorable enemies, about the year 455, after he had diſtributed all his goods to the poor in a time of famine, and had kept a little ſchool,

to

to get his bread. He was ingenious, and learned, and eloquent for thoſe times, and well verſed in the holy ſcriptures, even his adverſaries being judges, and he was commonly called, the *Roman Demoſthenes*. He is treated as an obſtinate heretic by S. Baſnage, Tillemont, Cave, Jenken in his *Defenſio Auguſtini adverſus Phereponum*, and many other moderns: but Du Pin ſpeaks candidly of him.

Jenken in his *Defenſio*, which is a mere panegyric upon Auguſtin, and an invective againſt Le Clerc, ſays of Julian; *At ſi Julianus qualis fuerit, novit Phereponus, cur fœda ejus et verba et crimina non notavit? cur eum contra S. Auguſtinum audiendum cenſuit? Hac præſertim in re; qui et* INCESTA LIBIDINE in ſororem ſuam laſciviret, *et obſcœnis Auguſtinum convitiis inſectaretur? Iſtud ſe Marius Mercator noviſſe affirmat. ——Ea ignorare Phereponus non potuit, ſaltem non debuit: multo autem minus debuit infamis hæretici auctoritate, quæ nulla eſt, adverſus Catholicæ Eccleſiæ Epiſcopum pugnare.*

As

As if any regard were to be paid to Mercator, a controverſialiſt by trade, and a profeſſed enemy and perſecutor of Julian, who ſtruck in with the violent party of thoſe days, and inſulted Theodorus Mopſueſtenus, Neſtorius, Julian, Theodoret, and the Pelagians, and who had the impudence to ſay of Theodoret that he was *inſpired by the devil!* If Jenken was reſolved at all adventures to believe him, he ſhould however have examined his voucher, ſuch as he was, a little more carefully; for even Mercator himſelf hath not charged Julian with *inceſtuous practices*, and Tillemont himſelf did not ſo underſtand the words of Mercator, which he hath tranſlated H. E. xiii. 818. Mercator, ſpeaking of Julian's ſiſters, who, as he ſays, had loſt their reputation, (fine ſtuff to be inſerted in religious controverſies!) cries out; *Tu merito duas ſorores tuas talibus diſciplinis tui oris erudiſti. Novimus, novimus quid tibi una earum, cum tu nimis ſeverus in ejus ruinam pudoris inſurgeres, objecerit vel exprobraverit: atque tu mutus illico non auſus ei ulterius cenſuræ tuæ ullas dolori ejus inferre moleſtias.* This *Mercator* ſeems to have been a dealer in *hear-ſays* and *calumnies*; and I wonder

that

that S. Baſnage, having obſerved of him, that he was extremely litigious, *in hereticos pugnax*, ſhould have added, *abundabat Mercator amore veritatis.* He might better have ſaid, *amore rixarum.*]

About the ſame time died St. Auguſtin, whoſe elogium may be ſeen in Biſhop Uſher. Fulgentius calls him *an inſpired man.*

The council of Epheſus, compoſed of two hundred and ten Biſhops, aſſembled A. D. 431. to condemn Neſtorius. Cyril of Alexandria preſided there, and during their ſeſſions, John Biſhop of Antioch, with thirty Biſhops, met together, and made canons contrary to thoſe of the council. What is remarkable is, that the two factions of Cyril and of John accuſed each other of Pelagianiſm; but the majority approved the depoſing of Julian and of the other Italian Biſhops whom Neſtorius had treated more gently. He himſelf was accuſed of holding Pelagian opinions, and of teaching that Jeſus Chriſt by the good uſe which he had made of his free-will, became the Son of God, and that God to reward his obedience had united him to the *eternal Word.* Therefore

fore the council of Epheſus condemned Pelagianiſm and Neſtorianiſm both together.

[Cyril and his righteous comrades, within the ſpace of one day, cited, examined, depoſed, and delivered over to Satan the unfortunate Neſtorius, who was abſent and unheard. They condemned him in the moſt reviling manner, but not without ſhedding plenty of tears over him, as they themſelves have told us, *lacrymis ſubinde perfuſi*. The tears of theſe *Epheſian fathers* were like the tears of the *Epheſian matron*, ſoon dried up, and they had the conſolation to kill old Neſtorius afterwards with repeated cruelty and ill uſage.

Neſtorius was a man retired and ſtudious, of a ſober life and regular converſation, and of an impetuous zeal againſt thoſe who were called heretics, whom he harraſſed and oppreſſed whilſt he had power and credit: ſo that if he had never diſputed about ſome intricacies of metaphyſical Divinity, and the *titles* of the Virgin Mary, we ſhould have found him enrolled amongſt the Saints, and he and Cyril would have been a couple of *burning tapers* in the Catholic Church.]

But notwithſtanding all this violence, and the care of three Popes, Cæleſtinus, Xyſtus III, and Leo I, Semipelagianiſm ſupported itſelf in Gaul. Perhaps the manner in which Cæleſtinus wrote to the French Biſhops contributed towards it; for though he warmly condemned Pelagius, and highly extolled St. Auguſtin, he ſaid at the end of the letter, that as to the profound and difficult queſtions which were mixed with the controverſy, and had been largely diſcuſſed by the Antipelagians, as he would not deſpiſe them, ſo neither could he think it neceſſary to determine any thing concerning them. We may ſee in Uſher's account how St. Proſper, and Xyſtus, and Leo laboured to confute or deſtroy Pelagianiſm and Semipelagianiſm.

A Monk called Fauſtus had retired from England to France, and was made Biſhop of Riez, after Maximus. A council was held at Arles about the year 463, and another at Lions; and this Fauſtus, by their order, drew up his ſentiments concerning the doctrine of grace, and made ſome additions to them, on account of certain new errors lately

lately diſcovered. Theſe errors were what the Divines of Marſeilles called the *predeſtinatian hereſy*, which ſome think to have been a real hereſy, and others judge to have been the very doctrine of St. Auguſtin.

[It is much diſputed whether theſe men were heretics. The Calviniſts are not willing to own it, and ſay, that they were neither more nor leſs than the orthodox followers of the orthodox Auguſtin, who were called *predeſtinatians*, and treated as heretics by the Pelagians. S. Baſnage contends for this, and juſtifies his old friends. He is right, I think, in determining that theſe were mere Auguſtinians. If Auguſtin then had wrong notions about grace and predeſtination, ſo had they.]

This work of Fauſtus is ſtill extant, and is entitled, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, addreſſed to Leontius Archbiſhop of Arles, and it moſt manifeſtly contains the Semipelagian doctrines.

Fauſtus ſent the opinions of the ſecond council of Arles to a predeſtinatian Preſbyter, one Lucidus, to oblige him to retract

his errors, and ſubſcribe to the doctrine of that council. We have his letter to Lucidus, and the anſwer of that Preſbyter addreſſed to the Biſhops aſſembled at Arles, in which he declares, *That he condemns the ſentiments of thoſe who thought that free-will was quite loſt after the fall of the firſt man; that Chriſt did not die for all men; that ſome are predeſtinated to death, and others to life; that from Adam to Jeſus Chriſt no Pagan had been ſaved, by the firſt grace of God, that is, by the law of nature, becauſe in our firſt father they loſt free will,* &c.

Some have affirmed that Fauſtus exceeded his commiſſion, and that many of thoſe who aſſiſted at the councils of Arles and of Lions, would not have ſubſcribed to his book. Yet it is hard to conceive that Fauſtus, a Biſhop in great eſteem, as it appears from the commendations given to him by Sidonius Apollinaris and by Gennadius, ſhould have had the aſſurance openly to aſcribe to a council ſentiments which moſt of its members held in abomination, and that they ſhould ſuffer him to do ſo without expreſſing their reſentment. They who ſay

that Fauſtus on this occaſion exceeded the bounds of his commiſſion, have only this poor reaſon to offer for it, that there could not have been ſo many Semipelagians in Gaul.

We may ſee in Uſher the judgments which ſeveral learned men have paſſed upon Fauſtus, moſt of which are not at all favourable to him. Thus it happens now to the old Semipelagians, as it happened formerly to the Pelagians: many who are entirely in their ſentiments, yet call them heretics, and condemn their perſons, only becauſe they were condemned by men who had more worldly intereſt and Eccleſiaſtical authority than they.

The book of Fauſtus remained not long unknown; it made its appearance at Conſtantinople, where the judgments were divided about it, ſome ſaying that it was orthodox, and others that it was heretical, as it appears from a letter of Poſſeſſor, an African Biſhop, who was then at Conſtantinople, and who wrote about it to Pope Hormiſda, A. D. 520, to know his ſentiments. Perſons of the higheſt quality, and amongſt

them, Vitalian, and Juſtinian who was afterwards Emperor, deſired to hear the opinion of the Church of Rome. Hormiſda declared himſelf againſt Fauſtus, and referred them for inſtruction to the books of St. Auguſtin of predeſtination and perſeverance.

There was then at Conſtantinople a Monk called Joannes Maxentius, who wrote an anſwer to the letter of Hormiſda, in which he compares the ſentiments of Auguſtin with thoſe of Fauſtus, and ſharply cenſures Poſſeſſor, and thoſe who maintained that the book of Fauſtus was orthodox. Hence it appears, that Poſſeſſor was a Semipelagian, and conſequently that the African councils had not yet been able to make all the Biſhops of that Church ſubmit to their deciſions.

During the heat of the Pelagian controverſy, the Vandals had ſeized Afric, and as they were Arians, they [q] expelled a great number of Biſhops who adhered to the deciſions of the Nicene council. Thraſamond king of the Vandals baniſhed ſixty of them to Sar-

[q] This was ſevere; but it was paying them in their own coin, and ſerving them juſt as they had ſerved other Chriſtians.

dinia,

dinia. They were conſulted by the Eaſterns concerning the controverſies about grace, rather to obtain a public declaration of their ſentiments, than to receive inſtructions; for they who wrote to thoſe Prelates were already liſted in a party, and in their letters condemned both the Pelagians and the books of Fauſtus. Fulgentius anſwered them in the name of the reſt, and delivered the ſentiments of St. Auguſtin in his letter, and alſo a treatiſe addreſſed to Paulus Diaconus. He compoſed other books on this ſubject, and ſeven againſt Fauſtus.

As Hilary and Leontius, Archbiſhops of Arles, had favoured Semipelagianiſm, Cæſarius who ſucceeded Leontius favoured what the Divines of Marſeilles called Prædeſtinatianiſm, or the ſentiments of St. Auguſtin. Under his direction was held the ſecond council of Orange, A. D. 529, which approved the doctrines of St. Auguſtin. Soon after this a council was held at Valentia, which condemned Semipelagianiſm; and Bonifacius II, in the year 531, approved the acts of this council.

Here endeth the hiſtory of Pelagianiſm and Semipelagianiſm, which yet was not extinguiſhed in Gaul or in England by ſo many efforts and ſo many decrees of the defenders of grace. See the hiſtory of Godeſcalc, written by Uſher.

What can we now conclude from all theſe things, according to the principles of St. Auguſtin, but this, that God would not annex the bleſſing of his irreſiſtible grace to the curſes, the confiſcations, the deprivations, and the baniſhments which pious Emperors and holy councils made uſe of againſt the poor Pelagians?" Le Clerc, *Bibl. Univ.* viii. 174.

"A PRESBYTER, called Leporius, had fallen into the opinion of ſome Eccleſiaſticks of Treves, who maintained that all men might be without ſin, though Jeſus Chriſt alone had been really free from it. This Pelagian retracted his opinions, in Afric, A.D. 425, and his retractation is publiſhed in the *Opera Sirmondi*. So Leporius was abſolved, and received again to the peace of the Church.

Church. The common method in ſuch caſes was to oblige a man to ſign certain words which they made uſe of without defining or underſtanding them." Le Clerc, *Bibl. A. & M.* xxviii. 262.

"THE BISHOP of Meaux accuſes Grotius of Semipelagianiſm. He muſt have had a ſmall ſhare of candor and ſincerity when he thus preſumed to cenſure and condemn this [r] learned man for an opinion, which is approved, under another name, by the council of Trent, by the Court of Rome, and by all the Antijanſeniſts in France. To condemn the ſentiments of Janſenius, or of St. Auguſtin, which are one and the ſame, and to declare ones ſelf againſt Semipelagianiſm, is a ſhameleſs and abſurd inconſiſtency. They who ſpeak ſincerely, acknowledge that the doctrine of Melancthon upon predeſtination and grace, which the Biſhop of Meaux calls Semipelagianiſm, is the very doctrine of the Roman Church and of the council of Trent; and they who ſpeak thus, are, to ſay the leaſt, men of as much eru-

[r] A man infinitely ſuperior to an hundred Boſſuets.

dition

dition and authority as the Biſhop, namely Cardinal Hoſius, who preſided at the council of Trent, and the Jeſuit Petavius. It is true, indeed, that theſe men pretend to be of St. Auguſtin's opinions, though in truth they are not. But in the Church of Rome, they who follow not this father are obliged to proteſt that they reverence and receive his doctrine; and they who receive it muſt declare that they anathematize the predeſtinating doctrines of Luther and Calvin, who yet were followers of Auguſtin.

The Biſhop alſo accuſes Grotius of ignorance concerning the progreſs in knowledge which St. Auguſtin had made, becauſe Grotius had ſaid that Auguſtin, when he diſputed with the Pelagians, talked in a quite different way from his former ſentiments. And yet the Biſhop cannot deny the fact.

Hence it follows that St. Auguſtin, whilſt he was Preſbyter, and in the firſt years of his Epiſcopacy, knew not the true and orthodox doctrine of predeſtination and grace, and yet thought himſelf fully qualified to perform the functions of an Eccleſiaſtic, one of which is to explain the Scriptures.

tures. Strange! that doctrines which were to paſs for articles of faith, and fundamentals, and which have made ſuch a dreadful noiſe and confuſion in the chriſtian world, were once ſo little known! St. Auguſtin was not only entirely ignorant of theſe points, but he held the very reverſe, as it manifeſtly appears from the books which he wrote when he was a Preſbyter, and in which he maintains free-will, juſt as others did in thoſe days.

He ſays, indeed, in his book of *the predeſtination of the Saints*, that whilſt he was of another opinion, he had been convinced of his miſtake, principally by 1 Cor. iv. 7. and that God had revealed this new doctrine to him. *Dixi hoc Apoſtolico præcipue teſtimonio etiam me ipſum fuiſſe convictum, cum hac de re aliter ſaperem; quam mihi Deus, in hac quæſtione ſolvenda, cum ad epiſcopum Simplicianum ſcriberem, revelavit.* We ſee by this, that St. Auguſtin learned this doctrine, not by hearing others preach it, nor by any inſtruction that he had received from learned divines or ancient fathers, but by profoundly meditating upon St. Paul whom he under-

underſtood not. He adds, according to cuſtom, that *God had*[r] *revealed it to him*, which excludes all human inſtruction. And now let the French Prelate go and boaſt of the uniform tradition of the Catholic Church, upon an important and eſſential point, which a famous and a venerable father of the fifth century, who had ſtudied divinity at leaſt for ſix years from the time of his taking orders, could not know but by *revelation!*" Le Clerc, *Bibl. Choiſ.* v. 341.

I HAVE no inclination to trace the hiſtory of this controverſy from the ſixth century to the eighteenth, but ſhall only mention a few memorable things relating to it. The reader will find a good abſtract of theſe diſputes in the Church of Rome, from the time of the council of Trent to the year 1689, in the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, by Le Clerc, T. xiv. 139. who cloſes the account much after the following manner;

[r] To all ſuch pretenders to inſpiration Eraſmus gives a proper anſwer; *Saltent igitur bonis avibus inter prophetas. Me nondum corripuit iſte ſpiritus. Ubi corripuerit, fortaſſe dicar et ipſe Saul inter prophetas.* Epiſt. 650.

" The

" The different views and intereſts of the Court of Rome, or the factions which happened to be ſtronger or weaker, led her to abſolve and to condemn the ſelf ſame doctrine under different denominations. Each party either magnified or deſpiſed her authority, according as they were treated by her, and pretended to hold in abomination the opinions which had been anathematized as heretical, for fear of offending her, whilſt they really maintained them under other names and in other expreſſions. The Church of Rome condemned St. Auguſtin and St. Thomas without being willing to do ſo, and defended the doctrines of the Semipelagians, or of the Reformed, without ſuffering it to be acknowledged. The divines, embarraſſed by equivocal expreſſions, and full of perplexity, could not diſtinguiſh friends from foes. The people, ſtunned and heated with theſe diſputes, took ſide, without knowing wherefore. The Powers acted, as is uſual, not with any diſcernment of the merits of the cauſe, but by intereſt and at the inſtigation of thoſe in whom they confided, without any reaſon to depend upon

upon their ſincerity or their ſkill; and oppreſſed and condemned one ſide, without being informed of the truth, which if the Eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies defended, it was by mere chance, as at other times they oppoſed it no leſs at random. Their equivocal deciſions were eluded by ſubtle diſtinctions which they dared not to diſcuſs. Violence was employed to ruin a party, for fear of being treated in the ſame manner, if it prevailed: and all theſe unrighteous proceedings were maſked with the godly pretence of maintaining orthodox doctrines, which want nothing beſides liberty of conſcience and a fair hearing, to ſatisfy reaſonable perſons and to plead their own cauſe. It is to be feared that Chriſtians will purſue the ſame methods, of diſputing about the means and helps to obtain moral goodneſs, without ſtudying to practiſe the thing itſelf. This account, however, may be of ſome uſe to teach men how to behave in like circumſtances, and to avoid the faults of others, without which a knowledge of thoſe quarrelſome tranſactions will be of ſmall importance."

Thomas Aquinas, in the year 1265, compoſed a body of Divinity, which was in great vogue at that time, and in the following centuries, till the Reformation.

Thomas held abſolute predeſtination, and Luther, who in his youth had ſtudied the ſyſtem of Thomas, retained this [t] doctrine, or rather carried it ſtill farther.

Calvin entered in the ſame ſentiments, and was a follower of Auguſtin.

The Calviniſts have generally adhered to Calvin's ſyſtem; but the Lutherans in this point, departed from their maſter.

Eraſmus was a Semipelagian, and wrote againſt Luther on this ſubject, and as he was of an open and ingenuous temper, he ſcrupled not to cenſure the Auguſtinian doctrines; in which, as in many other things, he did eminent ſervice to religion. He informs us, that the Lutherans called him a Pelagian. Epiſt DLXXXVII. p. 658.

[t] Which was alſo the doctrine of our Wickliff.

The

The divines of the Church of Rome in thoſe days were divided; ſome were Thomiſts, or Predeſtinatians, others Semipelagians, or ſomething extremely like it.

The council of Trent, A. D. 1547, condemned Luther's doctrine about predeſtination; but theſe fathers, who abounded more in wordly wiſdom than in grace, endeavoured to expreſs their own notions ſo as not to offend any party amongſt the Papiſts.

The Jeſuits, whoſe order was founded A. D. 1540, have, generally ſpeaking, been Semipelagians, and no friends to Auguſtin, though they permitted their brethren to liſt themſelves on either ſide. Bellarmin was an Auguſtinian.

About this time we had here a ſet of people called Goſpellers.

"They thought that if they magnified Chriſt much, and depended on his merits and interceſſion, they could not periſh which way ſoever they led their lives.—The doctrine of Predeſtination having been generally taught by the Reformers, many of this ſect began to make

make ſtrange inferences from it, reckoning that ſince every thing was decreed, and the decrees of God could not be fruſtrated, therefore men were to leave themſelves to be carried by theſe decrees. This drew ſome into great impiety of life, and others into deſperation. The Germans ſoon ſaw the ill effects of this doctrine. Luther changed his mind about it, and Melancthon openly wrote againſt it; and ſince that time the whole ſtream of the Lutheran Churches has run another way. But both Calvin and Bucer were ſtill for maintaining the doctrine of theſe decrees; only they warned the people not to think much of them, ſince they were ſecrets which men could not penetrate into: but they did not ſo clearly ſhew how theſe conſequences did not follow from ſuch opinions. Hooper and many other good writers did often dehort the people from entering into theſe curioſities; and a caveat to that ſame purpoſe was put afterwards into the article of the Church about predeſtination." Burnet, hiſt. of the Ref.

It is to be feared that theſe notions will prevail once more, eſpecially amongſt the lower people, and that we ſhall again be plagued with a ſect of Goſpellers.

To reaſon with ſuch perſons ſignifies little: *reaſon*, as well [v] as *learning*, is what they ſhun and diſregard, and to all your arguments they will oppoſe their own feelings and experiences. To oppreſs and perſecute them is ſcandalous in itſelf, and can produce no good effect. Never was any man beaten into a right underſtanding, and never did God give a bleſſing to ſuch proceedings. All that remains is to caution and exhort thoſe who have not caught the infection, and to try if we can in ſome meaſure ſerve and ſecure the next generation.

Molina, a Spaniſh Jeſuit, in the year 1588, defended the Semipelagian doctrines, which produced great quarrels between the Jeſuits, and their enemies the Dominicans, and other religious orders.

[v] Some of Luther's polite followers were thus repreſented by Eraſmus: *Hìc tui diſcipuli palam dicebant, diſciplinas humanas eſſe venenum pietatis, non eſſe diſcendas linguas, niſi Hebraicam.*

A. D. 1605. Clemens VIII, would have condemned the Jeſuits as Pelagians, if he had not died this year. He uſed to go in ſackcloth, and faſt, and pray, that he might be directed to determine juſtly upon the controverſy. One of the Cardinals obſerved of him that he would have been a Saint, if he had not left ſo much money to his relations.

Janſenius, a Dutchman, was made Biſhop of Ipres by the Spaniſh Court in 1635. He loved Auguſtin to a degree of infatuation and enthuſiaſm, and uſed to pore over him eternally. If the poor man had ſpent the ſame time and pains in ſtudying claſſical authors, and the Holy Scriptures, and the antient Greek fathers, he would probably have been a much better ſcholar, and no fataliſt. He compoſed a book of predeſtination and grace, upon the principles of his maſter, which he entitled *Auguſtinus*. In the opinion of unprejudiced men, he very fairly and fully repreſented the doctrines, and extracted the quinteſſence of Auguſtin.

Meſſieurs of Port Royal went into his ſyſtem, Arnauld ſignalized himſelf in his defence, and his numerous followers in France are called Janſeniſts.

The Janſeniſts, faithful diſciples of Auguſtin, would have degenerated, if they had not retained a taſte for perſecution. They wanted to *compel* the Jeſuits *to come in* to their ſentiments, or to draw down upon them Eccleſiaſtical cenſures, and excommunications: but the Jeſuits were too uſeful to the See of Rome, and too well protected there, to be condemned, and worried, and treated as Pelagians.

Pope Urban VIII, condemned the book of Janſenius, A. D. 1643.

Innocent X, by a Bull, A. D. 1653, condemned the five propoſitions extracted from Janſenius. The reaſon of this ſeverity ſeems to have been that Janſenius had let fall ſome expreſſions in his book which derogated from the papal omnipotence. The French King, moſt imprudently, received this Bull, and ordered it to be publiſhed in his dominions, and then Arnauld and the Janſeniſts

Janſeniſts were oppreſſed, and the ſect hath been in tribulation almoſt ever ſince: but as they would have done the ſame to their adverſaries, if they had enjoyed the power, they are the leſs to be pitied.

By this falſe ſtep, the Pope made the Janſeniſts his enemies, and neceſſitated them to maintain that Janſenius had taught no ſuch doctrines as he had imagined, and conſequently that Popes, with their counſellors, are not infallible judges of facts, but only of doctrines; a poſition which at length muſt ſubvert the favourite notion of the infallibility of the Church.

In the year 1656, a miracle was wrought amongſt the Janſeniſts at Port Royal, a miracle extolled by the party, and as much derided by their adverſaries.

Alexander VII, by a Bull, A. D. 1657, confirmed that of Innocent, and condemned the five propoſitions; and the Pope ſent over to France a formulary in which the ſubſcribers were to ſwear by Almighty God that they condemned theſe five propoſitions. The King and the Parliament confirmed it;

and the French Biſhops, to make their court to the King and to the Pope, compelled even young illiterate girls, who were Nuns, to ſubſcribe to the condemnation of Janſeniſm.

In the year 1707, Pope Clemens XI, publiſhed the Bull or Conſtitution called *Unigenitus*, in which he condemned Janſenius and his doctrines.

The Abbé de Paris, a zealous Janſeniſt and oppoſer of the Bull, died in 1725, and ſix years afterwards he wrought innumerable [w] miracles in ſupport of his friends againſt the Pope, the Jeſuits, and the Court of Rome.

This was an old trick, which had been practiſed by one party of Chriſtians againſt another from the fourth century downwards. St. Ambroſe played it off with great ſucceſs againſt the Arians, and confounded them by the miraculous Reliques of two new-diſcovered and imaginary Saints of a gigantic

[w] All the arguments urged againſt Chriſtianity, from the conſideration of theſe pretended miracles, by unfair and inconſiſtent writers, have been fully confuted by Mr. Adams and Dr. Leland.

ſtature,

ſtature, Protaſius and Gervaſius, and by the aid of a ſet of Dæmoniacs, who ſcreamed, and howled and performed their part to admiration. By this ſtratagem he won over the populace, and came off victorious. They who cannot digeſt ſuch miracles, and yet are willing to juſtify Ambroſe, muſt ſuppoſe that he himſelf was deceived by ſome under-actors, and muſt try to ſave his honour at the expence of his judgment.

In the beginning of the laſt century, the conteſt was vehement between the Remonſtrants and the Calviniſts in Holland. The latter engaged Prince Maurice on their ſide, and artfully turned a religious, into a political, quarrel; and being ſuperior in power, overcame their antagoniſts who ſurpaſſed them as much in judgment, learning, probity, and every thing that was commendable. They held a Synod at Dort, and eſtabliſhed their Calviniſtical decrees by cruel inſolence and oppreſſion. Thus the Remonſtrants were obliged to fly their country, and ſeek for refuge where they could find it, amongſt the Papiſts, to ſhun the barbarity of their fellow-citizens, who had not learned from

and the French Biſhops, to make their court to the King and to the Pope, compelled even young illiterate girls, who were Nuns, to ſubſcribe to the condemnation of Janſeniſm.

In the year 1707, Pope Clemens XI, publiſhed the Bull or Conſtitution called *Unigenitus*, in which he condemned Janſenius and his doctrines.

The Abbé de Paris, a zealous Janſeniſt and oppoſer of the Bull, died in 1725, and ſix years afterwards he wrought innumerable [w] miracles in ſupport of his friends againſt the Pope, the Jeſuits, and the Court of Rome.

This was an old trick, which had been practiſed by one party of Chriſtians againſt another from the fourth century downwards. St. Ambroſe played it off with great ſucceſs againſt the Arians, and confounded them by the miraculous Reliques of two new-diſcovered and imaginary Saints of a gigantic

[w] All the arguments urged againſt Chriſtianity, from the conſideration of theſe pretended miracles, by unfair and inconſiſtent writers, have been fully confuted by Mr. Adams and Dr. Leland.

ſtature,

ſtature, Protaſius and Gervaſius, and by the aid of a ſet of Dæmoniacs, who ſcreamed, and howled and performed their part to admiration. By this ſtratagem he won over the populace, and came off victorious. They who cannot digeſt ſuch miracles, and yet are willing to juſtify Ambroſe, muſt ſuppoſe that he himſelf was deceived by ſome under-actors, and muſt try to ſave his honour at the expence of his judgment.

In the beginning of the laſt century, the conteſt was vehement between the Remonſtrants and the Calviniſts in Holland. The latter engaged Prince Maurice on their ſide, and artfully turned a religious, into a political, quarrel; and being ſuperior in power, overcame their antagoniſts who ſurpaſſed them as much in judgment, learning, probity, and every thing that was commendable. They held a Synod at Dort, and eſtabliſhed their Calviniſtical decrees by cruel inſolence and oppreſſion. Thus the Remonſtrants were obliged to fly their country, and ſeek for refuge where they could find it, amongſt the Papiſts, to ſhun the barbarity of their fellow-citizens, who had not learned from

their own ſufferings the rights of conſcience, and the neceſſity of mutual forbearance. But theſe violent men trod in the ſteps of their own fathers; for the litigious temper of many of the Reformed in the low countries, their dogmatical deciſions of unimportant ſpeculations, their immortal hatred of toleration, their zeal for impoſing confeſſions of faith, and the fanatical, ambitious, and turbulent ſpirit of ſeveral of their Eccleſiaſtics, make it a matter of wonder to poſterity how the Proteſtant religion was ever eſtabliſhed there. Nothing but the diabolical cruelty of the Spaniſh government, which became inſupportable even to the Dutch Papiſts, could, humanly ſpeaking, have brought about a Reformation.

At the ſame time there were warm conteſts upon an important point, whether the Clergy aſſembled in Councils and Synods had a right to make and enforce Eccleſiaſtical laws and articles of faith, without the leave of the Civil Magiſtrate. The Calviniſts held the affirmative, the Remonſtrants were of the contrary opinion, and Grotius who was a Remonſtrant, wrote againſt theſe petty

petty tyrants his book, *De imperio ſummarum poteſtatum circa ſacra*; which was ſhewed to ſome friends, but not publiſhed till after his death. Another queſtion of no leſs moment was about the puniſhment of heretics, and the nature of toleration. Calvin and Beza, and moſt of their diſciples, thought it right to burn heretics, or at leaſt to apply the wholeſome diſcipline of fines, jails, ſtripes, impriſonments, and baniſhments. The Remonſtrants not only condemned ſuch procedures, but declared that they would receive to their communion all thoſe who allowed the ſcriptures to be the only rule of faith, kept themſelves from idolatry, declared their diſlike of perſecution, and promiſed that they would endeavour to live ſuitably to the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Contraremonſtrants compelled not only Eccleſiaſtics, Profeſſors, Schoolmaſters, and young Students to ſign their articles, but even Muſicians. The Organiſt of Harlem, who was an excellent performer, being commanded by the Magiſtrates to ſubſcribe, deſired to be excuſed, but offered to ſerve them in his way, to ſet the words of their

their Canons to muſic, and to play them in the Church, if they liked it: upon which he was turned out. Brandt, who tells us this ſtory, ſays that ſeveral Muſicians were expelled from the Churches for refuſing to comply; and that the Organiſt of Utrecht immediately ſubſcribed the Canons, without reading them; and being exhorted by the impoſers to peruſe them once at leaſt, he refuſed, ſaying; *It is needleſs. I know well enough that you, Gentlemen, would not require me to do an ill thing.*

Father Paul approved of the doctrines and proceedings of the Synod of Dort, and wrote thus to Daniel Heinſius; — "As the Elect only participate of the divine grace, ſo none but they can be ſenſible of its efficacy and operation. For neither the world, nor the fleſh, nor the night-raven, which has not ſight ſtrong enough, can bear the light. It is my opinion, not only that faith is the gift of God, but likewiſe that the true conception of faith, and its cauſes and effects, is not granted to the wiſe men of this world. Happy are you to whom the divine myſteries are revealed from heaven! Your Chriſtian

Chriſtian Synod has had the ſkill to diſtinguiſh the doctrine of the Apoſtles from carnal notions, and condemning the latter, has piouſly embraced the former. And moſt prudently have the illuſtrious States proceeded in ſtopping the mouths of your adverſaries, by exerting that authority which is peculiar to Sovereigns in Eccleſiaſtical matters. But it is not ſtrange that ſuch people ſhould join with your enemies. Errors that are moſt oppoſite and contradictory will more eaſily be reconciled to each other, than to the truth, though it lies in the middle, &c."

"From this letter we may obſerve two things: the firſt is, that father Paul adhered to the opinions of the Dominicans and the Contraremonſtrants in the point of predeſtination; which is likewiſe obvious in his hiſtory of the Council of Trent, concerning which the Engliſh divine, Heylin, writes, *That the authority of father Paul, whatever credit he may deſerve in hiſtorical matters, ought not to be admitted in doctrinal points, any further than it is ſupported by reaſon.* In the next place, we may obſerve from his letter, what ill impreſſions Heinſius ſeems to have

have made on him in prejudice of the Remonſtrants, by treating them as people who ſided with the common enemy: but the falſity of this charge hath ſince appeared plainly enough. As for the reſt of his letter, I leave it as I find it, and the reader may judge of it as he pleaſes." Brandt, Vol. iv. p. 80.

Every reaſonable man muſt judge it to be exceſſively mean and fanatical, and altogether unworthy of father Paul. Daniel Heinſius was ſecretary to the Synod, and treated the Remonſtrants there with great unfairneſs, and rudeneſs. He alſo wrote againſt them, and undertook a taſk for which he was very unfit; which provoked them to attack his conduct and character, and to ſet him in a diſadvantageous light.

The Contraremonſtrants hated the memory of their country-man Eraſmus, as much as they did the perſons of Epiſcopius and Grotius, and wanted to have his ſtatue pulled down. They could not bear the ſight of this hero, even in braſs: it had the ſame effect upon them as Statius ſuppo-

ſes

ſes the image of Hercules to have had upon the Argives;

[x] *Haud illum impavidi, quamvis et in ære, ſuumque Inachidæ videre decus.*

Two of their divines, elated with victory, inſulted a poor fellow who was a Remonſtrant, and ſaid, What are you thinking of, with that grave and woful face? I was thinking, gentlemen, ſaid he, of a controverted queſtion, Who was the author of ſin. Adam ſhifted it off from himſelf, and laid it to his wife; ſhe laid it to the ſerpent; the ſerpent who was then young and baſhful, had not a word to ſay for himſelf; but afterwards growing older and more audacious, he went to the Synod of Dort, and there he had the aſſurance to charge it upon God. Brandt.

Bayle, in his diſputes againſt the wiſdom and the goodneſs of God, being puſhed by his antagoniſts, and compelled to declare what ſort of a Chriſtian he pretended to be, profeſſed himſelf a Predeſtinarian Proteſtant of the moſt rigid ſort; but no Proteſtant of

[x] Theb. vi. 272.

any

any denomination ever was ſimple enough to believe him.

Bayle frequently took occaſion to ſhew his diſapprobation of the Remonſtrants. The true cauſe of his diſguſt ſeems to have been this; they endeavoured to prove the reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, and to vindicate the goodneſs of God, and would not give up the divine perfections as unintelligible and indefenſible. They ought not, ſays he, to have removed the bounds ſet up by their fathers. I ſhould have thought that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts were to be looked upon as our Chriſtian fathers, rather than the Calvins and the Bezas.

They ought not, ſays he, to have made diſturbances. But that was not their fault; it was the fault of thoſe who quarrelled with them, and would not tolerate them. Their refinements, ſays he, ſignified nothing, and they could not defend Chriſtianity any better than the Calviniſts; for it is all one whether God be the author and the puniſher of ſin, or whether he foreſees ſin, and permits it, and then puniſhes it with eternal miſery. Theſe and the reſt of his

his objections drawn up with ſuch a profuſion of words, and ſo much pains, and parade, and indecent language, were conſidered and fully confuted by Le Clerc in his *Bibliotheque Choiſ.*

The ſyſtem of the Remonſtrants, as he is pleaſed to obſerve, is full of conſiderable errors. This is the mean and ſpiteful remark of a man who knew almoſt as little of divinity as he did of natural philoſophy.

In England, at the time of the Synod of Dort, we alſo were much divided in our opinions concerning the controverted articles; but our divines having taken the liberty to think and judge for themſelves, and the civil government not interpoſing, it hath come to paſs that, from that time to this, almoſt all perſons here of any note for learning and abilities have bid adieu to Calviniſm, have ſided with the Remonſtrants, and have left the Fataliſts to follow their own opinions, and to rejoice (ſince they can rejoice) in a religious ſyſtem, conſiſting of human creatures without liberty, doctrines without ſenſe, faith without reaſon, and a God without mercy.

This

This ſyſtem, ſo far as it relates to the eternal miſery of infants for the fault of Adam, is the very fable of the Wolf and the Lamb:

Ante hos ſex menſes male, ait, dixiſti mihi.
Reſpondit agnus; equidem natus non eram.
Pater, hercule, tuus, inquit, maledixit mihi.

"Nothing burns in hell, but our own will." So ſays Bernard, a father, and a Saint of the twelfth century: and he is highly to be commended for being the father of ſo good an aphoriſm, which is worth half his writings, and all his miracles.

Our Diſſenters [y], in the laſt century, were generally abſolute Predeſtinarians, and one of their conſtant clamours againſt the Clergy of the Church of England was that they were Arminians, a name which ſounded as dreadfully in Supralapſarian ears, as that of Infidel, or Atheiſt.

Heylin wrote the hiſtory of the *five articles*, in which he endeavours to ſhew that

[y] Juſtice and candor require us to except many of thoſe of the preſent times.

the

the Church of England, though willing to tolerate the Calviniſts, yet hath always been of the opinion of the Remonſtrants in thoſe points.

Whitby publiſhed ſome tracts on election, reprobation, and original ſin; and in theſe treatiſes he confuted Calviniſm even to a demonſtration.

HE who is deſirous to find religious truth, muſt ſeek her in the Holy Scriptures, interpreted by good ſenſe and ſober criticiſm, and embrace no theological ſyſtems any farther than as they are found conſiſtent with the word of God, with right reaſon, and with themſelves. A theological ſyſtem is too often a temple conſecrated to implicit faith, and he who enters in there to worſhip, inſtead of leaving his ſhoes, after the Eaſtern manner, muſt leave his underſtanding at the door; and it will be well if he find it, when he comes out again.

DISSERTATION III.

On the duty of judging candidly and favourably of others, and of human nature.

QVAM TEMERE IN NOSMET LEGEM
SANCIMVS INIQVAM!

DISSERTATION III.

On the duty of judging candidly and favourably of others, and of human nature.

---

1 COR. xiii. 5.

Charity — thinketh no evil.

THE meaning which ſeveral Commentators have given to theſe words is, that charity is not cenſorious, that it thinketh favourably of others when there is room for it, and thinketh not hardly of them, unleſs a manifeſt reaſon requires it: and in this ſenſe I ſhall at preſent take them, without entering into other interpretations.

In this ſenſe they certainly repreſent to us a Chriſtian duty, and we may boldly appeal

to all the world, whether this be not an amiable diſpoſition, and whether we ſhould not be glad to find it in all thoſe with whom we have any intercourſe and acquaintance. And yet this part of charity, which conſiſts in thinking no evil, hath not eſcaped cenſure, but hath been repreſented rather as an injudicious weakneſs than as a good quality. I ſhall produce the objection which hath been made to it, and then ſhew how weak, how fooliſh, and how wicked it is.

"The laws of Chriſtian charity, ſays this celebrated writer, which require us rather to give a favourable turn to the actions of our neighbour than an unfavourable one, are quite contrary to reaſon.

For it is as certain as any thing can be, that man is infinitely more prone to evil than to good, and that there are infinitely more bad than good actions done in the world.

It is therefore beyond degree more probable that an action is bad than that it is good, and that the ſecret motives which produce it are corrupted than that they are honeſt.

Accord-

According then to the dictates of reaſon, if we know that a man hath done an action, and are ignorant of his motive and intent, we ſhould judge it to be far more probable that he acts from bad than from good cauſes.

And yet the laws of charity require that unleſs we have a very probable evidence of the wickedneſs of an action, we ſhould rather conclude it to be good than bad.

Thus charity directs us to do juſt the contrary to the dictates of reaſon: and indeed this is not the only ſacrifice which religion requires us to make of our reaſon[a]."

Thus far goes the objection; upon which I ſhall juſt obſerve by the way, that when the author of it was repreſented by ſeveral

[a] " J'aurois bien des choſes a dire, ſi je voulois examiner pourquoi les loix de la Charité, qui nous engagent à donner plûtot un tour favorable aux actions de notre prochain, qu'un tour déſavantageux, ſont ſi contraires a la raiſon," &c. Bayle, *Lettres crit.* xii. p. 248. In which he endeavours to prove, that none can receive the Chriſtian religion unleſs he will think and act contrary to reaſon; that is, in other words, unleſs he be fool or mad.

perſons as one who had no religion, he was extremely angry, and loudly complained of ill treatment; and yet this very argument of his proved, if it proved any thing, that he was only uſed according to the dictates of human reaſon, which bids us think ill of our neighbour. This is an honour to St. Paul's deſcription of charity, that a man cannot contradict it, without being taken in a contradiction himſelf. They who judge it reaſonable to think ill of all others, hold it unreaſonable that others ſhould think ill of them, which ſurely is very abſurd and ridiculous.

It hath been ſaid that it is not prudent to propoſe difficulties which we cannot remove; but in the caſe before us there is no danger of that kind, and it ſeems no hard taſk to defend Chriſtian charity, and St. Paul's account of it, againſt the cavils of men wiſe in their own conceits.

I ſhall therefore proceed to explain and to juſtify the character which St. Paul gives of charity, or of a charitable man, that he thinketh no evil, keeping the objection in view, and ſhewing that it is groundleſs.

The

The objection is built upon an aſſertion that there is infinitely more evil than good done in all times and places; which though confidently advanced as a thing undeniable, is utterly falſe, and ſhews a groſs or a wilful ignorance of human nature and matter of fact: for men, bad as they are, with all their faults and frailties, are not ſo bad as theſe perverſe writers have been pleaſed to repreſent them. As the objection takes in Chriſtians as well as others, we will, without diſtinguiſhing or excepting them, conſider how the caſe ſtands in general, and as it lies open every where to daily obſervation. But firſt let us conſider the nature of man and of his actions.

Man is guided by two principles, by reaſon; and by paſſion, affection, or appetite; and it is his nature to act for the moſt part upon motives. Let us ſee then what motives he has to good and to evil.

His motives to good are many in number; they are theſe:

Reaſon, which approves what is right and condemns what is wrong, ſo that when a man

a man doth amiſs, he commonly acts againſt his conſcience, his knowledge and his judgment. Reaſon and experience teach us alſo that good actions are uſually profitable, and that bad actions are pernicious. Here the innate love of happineſs joins with reaſon and experience, and prompts us to purſue that which is commendable, and juſt, and uſeful.

Education likewiſe generally gives men a good bent; for in all civilized nations young perſons are inſtructed to prefer virtue to vice.

The love of reputation and the fear of diſgrace, or of puniſhment, have the ſame tendency.

Natural affection alſo, a love of parents, kindred, friends and benefactors, prompts us to render ourſelves uſeful and agreeable to them, which we cannot well accompliſh without exerciſing the ſocial and the civil duties.

Religion, to which belongs the hope of future rewards and the dread of future puniſhments, is unqueſtionably a great motive to well doing, and produces conſiderable effects, and if it makes not men ſo righteous

as

as they ſhould be, it certainly makes them far better than they elſe would be, and keeps them from a multitude of offences which they would otherwiſe have committed.

Let us ſee, on the contrary, what motives men have to commit evil.

It happens not unfrequently that virtue conſiſts in undergoing preſent inconvenience, whilſt the pleaſure that it yields is more remote and follows at a diſtance, and that vice brings immediate pleaſure and is not attended with any ſudden bad conſequence that is felt. The paſſions and appetites of men, which unleſs regulated by reaſon, purſue preſent pleaſure, and ſhun preſent uneaſineſs, regardleſs of the future, and the temptations ariſing from outward objects, are motives to evil.

Add to this, a bent and propenſity which moſt perſons experience towards ſome particular fault, a predominant paſſion which eaſily degenerates and becomes a vice: add likewiſe the contagious influence of bad example. Theſe are the general incitements to ſin.

I have

I have not ſpoken of thoſe more latent cauſes of good and evil, of which mention is made ſometimes in the Scriptures, as the ſeductions and temptations of evil ſpirits, and the favourable influence of the divine Spirit, or the aid of good ſpirits acting under his direction, and by his appointment; but in theſe ſecret cauſes, thoſe which incite to good ſhould be ſuppoſed the moſt powerful and prevalent, ſince greater is he who is for us than they who are againſt us.

Now from all theſe motives to good and to evil, it muſt follow that man will uſually and generally be a fickle and changeable creature, not ſteddy either to good or to bad, but paſſing from the one to the other and often blending both together; yet however, upon the whole, performing more actions which are good, or innocent at leaſt, than bad ones, becauſe he hath far more inducements to the former than to the latter.

Such kind of reaſoning, it may be replied, is deceitful and unſatisfactory, and it is experience at laſt that muſt decide the queſtion, and not arguments drawn from

the nature of man, and from the motives which may be ſuppoſed to influence him. Be it ſo: to experience we will appeal, and to matter of fact; and we ſhall ſoon find that more good than evil is done in the world, elſe the world could not ſubſiſt, and civil ſociety muſt diſband.

Let us take for example one of a middle ſtation, who paſſeth his days quiety in all appearance, and lives in tolerable credit and repute; for of ſuch perſons the bulk of ſociety conſiſts.

He hath then a calling or occupation, in which he ſpends at leaſt half of the waking hours of his life. Thus at the very firſt account which we take of him, we muſt ſet down half of his actions as good, at leaſt, not bad. I will not ſay that theſe are what we call moral virtues, or religious deeds; and yet ſo far as they are done honeſtly, in obedience to God and to ſociety, and with a view to live reputably and without being a burden to others, ſo far they undoubtedly partake of the nature of virtue.

He

He has a family, a wife, and children, and ſervants, and he takes care of them. A thouſand good actions are neceſſary to perform this, and to live orderly and decently at home, which muſt be added to the account.

He has dealings with others who employ him and truſt him; conſequently he is in all probability honeſt in his dealings. Here likewiſe many good actions are to be ſuppoſed.

He has friends and acquaintances and relations who eſteem him, and are willing to do him ſervice; conſequently he behaves himſelf well towards them, elſe he would be deſerted and ſlighted.

We may add to this, that he performs ſome acts of charity, that his heart has aked for the miſeries of others, and his hand hath relieved them, that he has undertaken offices expenſive and troubleſome to himſelf through friendſhip, or gratitude, or pity, or good nature, or honour.

Add to this, that he has religion, that he frequents the publick worſhip of God, that when

when he commits faults, he condemns himſelf, and is ſenſible of his deviations, and ſorry for his defects.

Since the generality of men are nearly ſuch as we have been repreſenting, and perform many more good than bad actions, not only humanity and charity, but juſtice and common honeſty, forbid us to ſay of mankind in general that they do far more evil than good. He who doth far more evil than good muſt be remarkably and ſcandalouſly wicked.

It may be ſaid, that both writers of morality and the Scriptures themſelves repreſent mankind in general as ſinners and prone to evil, and, in a word, worſe than we have deſcribed them. But then it muſt be obſerved, that they conſider men in quite another view, namely, as obliged to live according to the dictates of right reaſon, and to the precepts of God, which when they do not, they become ſinners. For it is not the performing more good than bad actions that denominates a man good in the moral and religious ſenſe; and though he may frequently practiſe what is right, and honeſt, and humane,

mane, and honourable, and reaſonable, yet if he perſiſts in any one evil habit, and is wilfully deficient in any one moral duty, he is conſidered in a ſtate of enmity with virtue and religion, till repentance and reformation reſtores him to the condition whence he is fallen. If he be a ſtubborn and a deliberate tranſgreſſor, he is conſidered as a violator of the law, and a deſpiſer of the authority of the law-giver; as in civil ſociety, if a man commits a capital crime, his having obſerved all the reſt of the law will not exempt him from puniſhment.

The Scriptures frequently forbid raſh judgments and cenſorioufneſs, and a miſrepreſentation of other mens actions, and hard thoughts concerning them, and yet teach all men, with relation to God and to his holy will and commandments, to acknowledge themſelves ſinners, and incapable of being juſtified in his ſight by their own righteouſneſs.

Therefore, though humility commands us to think lowly of ourſelves, and of others, and of human nature, and to own that man is not worthy of the leaſt of God's mercies, yet

yet charity forbids us to think ſo ill of the whole race, as to ſuppoſe that they are always doing evil, and that their beſt actions proceed from bad motives.

Many who had no good will to revealed religion, have taken a perverſe delight in blackening human nature, and many weak and ignorant Chriſtians have done and daily do the ſame thing; and thus with different views theſe ſworn enemies have joined together, and aſſiſted each other in abuſing and ſlandering mankind.

The firſt often repreſents man as a moſt abject and deſpicable animal, whoſe vices are naturally woven in his conſtitution, and who is intended for no better purpoſe than to keep up a ſucceſſion of generations upon earth, and then to ſink into eternal oblivion. The ſecond imagines that original or hereditary ſin is an entire depravity, by which man is ſtripped both of power and of inclination to do any one good action; but that the Elect, of whom himſelf is always one, are ſaved by irreſiſtible grace, and by a bare belief that they are elected, and ſo go to heaven upon very commodious terms, whilſt all

around them are doomed to periſh everlaſtingly, to the honour of the ſupreme Being, and to the great comfort of his favourites. Now this total corruption of man is a mere [b] fiction, and all that we can collect from the Scriptures concerning our depravity, is this, that after our firſt parents had fallen from a ſtate of innocence, the temptations to ſin were increaſed, but the natural powers to reſiſt thoſe temptations were not deſtroyed, and the favourable aſſiſtances of the divine Spirit were not withdrawn.

Thus God's fair creation, which he pronounced to be good and upright, hath been vilified by profane ſcoffers or injudicious Chriſtians: but there have not been wanting able advocates, to make a proper apology for the ſons of Adam, and the ſubſtance of what they have ſaid amounts to this.

[c] God made man in his own image, and impreſſed upon him ſome characters of the divine original, the principal of which is

[b] In lord Bacon's language, *idolum cerebri.*

[c] Barrow; from whom ſome of the following remarks are borrowed.

goodneſs, though it be not the beſt preſerved, for it is of a tender complexion, and delicate nature; and yet the lovely traces of it are ſtill extant, and ſtill ſhine, though oft-times faintly and with a faded luſtre.

For goodneſs is univerſally approved; juſtice, equity, truth, ſincerity, candour, beneficence, mercy, ever have paſſed, and ever will paſs, for virtues.

There is no man who does not deſire that others would exerciſe them towards him; even they who are deficient in the practiſe of them, yet pay them the decent reſpect to think and to ſpeak well of them.

There is no man who does not condemn fraud, malice, cruelty, treachery, ingratitude, injuſtice, eſpecially when he is made to experience the ill effects of them.

No man ever acted uprightly and honourably who did not feel a calm ſerenity, a complacency and ſatisfaction; none ever purſued wicked courſes without ſome degree of ſhame and regret, and ſelf-condemnation, and ſome ſtruggles of expiring virtue.

None, except here and there a brute, ever received great favours and benefits, who had not, out of mere natural ingenuity, a grateful ſenſe of them, and an intention to teſtify it, and to make ſomewhat of a return.

No man, except hardened by a long courſe of villainy, ever ſaw others in great pain, and want, and ſorrow, and diſtreſs, and found not a diſpoſition to commiſerate and aſſiſt them, though he could expect from them no other return than thanks.

Hiſtory abounds with examples of men who through natural inclination, through generoſity and nobleneſs of mind, have done great ſervices to their friends, to their country, to ſtrangers, to foreigners, to mankind in general, who to accompliſh theſe ends have denied themſelves many advantages and pleaſures, have encountered many inconveniencies, hardſhips, and dangers, and have even loſt their lives, without a view to any worldly recompence, except perhaps that they hoped and expected to be honoured, living or dead, by thoſe whom they had obliged,

obliged, and by judicious and worthy perſons. And this ſurely cannot greatly derogate from their virtuous deeds: it only ſhews, that beſides a natural ſweetneſs of temper and greatneſs of ſoul, they had alſo ſome regard to reputation, and a deſire to ſtand fair in the opinion of the public, and to receive what they juſtly deſerved, the love and the eſteem of their fellow creatures. And why not? ſince God himſelf requires our acknowledgments and our affections for his loving-kindneſs? Thus it hath ever been, and thus it is ſtill in the world: inſtances are not wanting of conſtancy, of friendſhip, of fidelity, of gratitude, of compaſſion, of integrity, many of which eſcape the notice of the public, and are perhaps only obſerved of God and good Angels, being ſeldom tranſacted in high life, and under ſplendid roofs and palaces.

The moſt judicious philoſophers and the moſt acute obſervers of the human frame and conſtitution, have pronounced man to be a creature naturally tame and gentle, and ſociable and tractable, who by the help of good laws and good examples, and good

teachers and governors, may be made good and uſeful to the world.

Our adverſaries will not admit thus much. They have commonly, as no good opinion of God, ſo no favourable opinion of men; in ſhort, ſome of them have no eſteem of themſelves, and finding little moral honeſty at home, in their own breaſts, they are willing to ſuppoſe the reſt of the world to be no better. And this is probably one great motive which induces them to draw an hideous portrait of human nature, loaded with the ugly features of craft, baſeneſs, malice, ſuſpicion, ſelfiſhneſs, and diſſimulation, by which they have transformed this earth into a hell, where as many men, ſo many Devils ſurround us.

Let us now ſee in what ſenſe and in what inſtances charity thinketh no evil.

Firſt of all, we ſhould do the ſame juſtice to an Apoſtle, which we would do to other writers, that is, to interpret his words fairly, and not to ſtrain them beyond the intention of the author. Suppoſing then that the Apoſtle intended to recommend a candid

candid diſpoſition in forming a judgment concerning the actions of others, the meaning of his words muſt be this, that charity judgeth not hardly and ſeverely, when there is room to think well, or when there is reaſon to ſuſpend the judgment, and to remain uncertain.

There are a multitude of actions which are of an indifferent nature, and have nothing moral in them, and deſerve neither praiſe nor blame. Setting theſe aſide, the other actions of men are bad, or they are good, or have at leaſt the appearance of goodneſs.

There are actions which are bad, and which all the world have agreed in condemning, and it cannot be ſuppoſed that charity requires us to think well of them. But herein the charitable differs from the cenſorious man, that he never aggravates the faults of others, that if there be any circumſtances mitigating the offence, he never willingly overlooks them, and that in forming judgments of men he conſiders their good as well as their bad qualities.

There are actions which appear to be, and which probably are good, and concerning theſe it is that charity thinketh no evil. And here lies the main of the diſpute; for the adverſaries of human nature will inſiſt upon it that the good actions of men proceed from bad motives, and are only vices with a fair face. The contrary to this is very evident. Good actions, or actions which appear to be good, can ſcarcely proceed from any other than honeſt motives. Let any one conſult his own heart, and he will find that the motives to well-doing are theſe, a love of goodneſs ſtrengthened by education and cuſtom, or a propenſity to ſome particular virtue, or a view to pleaſe God, or a fear to offend him, or a hope of future rewards, or a dread of future puniſhments, or a deſire to ſtand fair in the opinion of mankind, or a regard to ſome of the preſent advantages ariſing from a commendable behaviour. Of theſe motives ſome are more excellent than others, but not one of them is vitious, and capable of utterly ſpoiling a good action. It is not eaſy to name any caſe in which evil intentions produce actions apparently good, except

except one, which is this: there are perſons who have wicked deſigns which they cannot execute without impoſing upon the world, and pretending to virtues which they have not. Such perſons may do things which are in themſelves right and commendable, but for which they deſerve no praiſe, becauſe their views are bad. But it is unfair on account of ſuch diſſemblers to judge hardly in general of actions in which nothing blameable can be diſcerned.

If there be any perſons whom it is reaſonable to ſuſpect, they are thoſe who pretend to more than ordinary ſanctity and fervour, and to more than ordinary aſſiſtances of the Spirit, and are very ſevere and cenſorious in their judgments of others whoſe religion is leſs noiſy, and whoſe zeal is more diſcreet. Hiſtory informs us, that ſuch *ſaints* have done infinite miſchief in the world, and cautions us to be upon our guard againſt them; and the Scriptures which recommend to us ſo much candour and equitable fairneſs in our judgments, yet allow us to have ſome of the ſerpent's prudence, and to beware of thoſe who either deceive or are deceived.

It is urged by thoſe who depreciate mankind, that ſelf-love is the corrupted fountain of all human virtues. And this is the principal argument on which they reſt their cauſe: from this general fault, ſay they, none are free[d], except thoſe Chriſtians in whom the grace of God overcomes the evil principle. This is added by way of ridicule, or to throw duſt in the eyes of the ſimple.

But here they ignorantly or wilfully confound two ſorts of ſelf-love, which both ſcripture and reaſon teach us to diſtinguiſh. Wicked men ſhall be lovers of themſelves, ſay the Scriptures: here is vitious ſelf-love. Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf, ſay the Scriptures: here is innocent ſelf-love. The deſire of happineſs and the love of ourſelves are natural affections, and therefore, like other paſſions, they are harmleſs; but when they are ſuffered to go beyond their bounds, and to incroach upon the love which is due to God and to our neighbour, and to weaken or deſtroy it, then they be-

[d] See the Diſcourſe prefixed to Rouchefoucault's Maxims.

come

come vitious in various degrees, and not before.

To conſider ourſelves as what we really are, a part of the creation, and to deſire the ſhare of happineſs which is deſigned for us; to conſider other beings alſo as what they really are, and to do to them as we could reaſonably wiſh they ſhould do to us; to promote the happineſs and leſſen the miſery of all creatures, as far as we can; this is morality and virtue: a morality built upon our own intereſt diſtinct from that of others, is a doctrine not fit even for the ſchools of Pagan philoſophers, but for the dens of boors and ſavages.

To conclude; charity thinketh no evil of others, ſince uſually it thinketh not at all about them, that is, about their faults. There is a diſpoſition which the writers of the New Teſtament often reprimand and condemn, and that is a pragmatical impertinence in meddling with the concerns and characters of other people. The charitable man is free from this fault. He has work to do of his own; it is enough for him to watch over his own conduct. He is not curious

curious to know how others act, and in what they are deficient, and is neither a ſpreader nor a receiver of idle reports concerning them; he has no leiſure and no genius for ſuch mean occupations, but ſtudies to be quiet, and to mind his own buſineſs.

DIS-

DISSERTATION IV.

On the love of praiſe and reputation, and the proper bounds and degree of that love.

PROFVNDA SVPRA NOS ALTITVDO TEMPORIS VENIET: PAVCA INGENIA CAPVT EXSERENT, ET IN IDEM QVANDOQVE SILENTIVM ABITVRA, OBLIVIONI RESISTENT, AC SE DIV VINDICABVNT.

DISSERTATION IV.

On the love of praiſe and reputation, and the proper bounds and degree of that love.

JOHN xii. 43.

For they loved the praiſe of men more than the praiſe of God.

THOUGH our Saviour wrought a ſurpriſing variety of beneficial miracles in confirmation of a reaſonable doctrine, yet the Jews, as St. John tells us in this chapter, that is, the greater part of the Jews, believed not in him; the number of thoſe who profeſſed themſelves his diſciples was very ſmall. But beſides thoſe who followed him, and thoſe who were his open enemies,

enemies, there were ſeveral, ſays St. John, who in their hearts acknowledged him, but durſt not declare their ſentiments: "Never-"theleſs, amongſt the chief rulers alſo, "many believed in him; but becauſe of the "Phariſees, they did not confeſs him, leſt "they ſhould be put out of the ſynagogue: "for they loved the praiſe of men more than "the praiſe of God."

Their ſin ſeems not to have been of the blackeſt and the moſt heinous nature, and there is room for a charitable conjecture that their good diſpoſitions at laſt prevailed over their weakneſs, their vanity, and their fear, and that after the reſurrection of Chriſt and the effuſion of the Holy Spirit they joined themſelves to his diſciples.

But by not daring openly to declare their faith in Chriſt, whilſt he was upon earth, they acted againſt their own conſcience, and excluded themſelves at that time from the great benefits which he came to confer upon his ſervants. Their ſtate, whilſt they continued in it, was very dangerous.

The

The love of praiſe is here repreſented as the cauſe which produced theſe bad effects, whence we may conclude that it is a fault; yet it is eaſy to prove that the love of praiſe cannot be entirely unlawful; nor indeed are theſe perſons here condemned becauſe they loved the praiſe of men, but becauſe they loved it more than the praiſe of God.

My diſcourſe therefore upon this ſubject ſhall conſiſt of two parts, and I will ſhew,

I. That we may love the praiſe of men in ſome degree.

II. That our love of it ſhould be moderate.

I. The love of praiſe ſeems to be natural to us, and a part of ſelf-love. We love ourſelves; we deſire therefore that others ſhould eſteem us, ſhould think and ſpeak well of us; we ſeem to multiply ourſelves by having a place in the thoughts of ſo many perſons, and to triumph in ſome manner over our *laſt enemy*, when our name ſurvives with honour after we are gone hence.

We read in fabulous hiſtory of heroes and favourites of the Gods, who, though they could not be preſerved from death, were transformed into flowers, which annually reviving and blooming, enjoyed [a] a kind of immortality. A poetical image of the honours paid in civilized countries to public benefactors by ſtated commemorations.

Not only they who are eminent in rank and abilities, but perſons of all ſtations uſually love and value a good name and a fair character, and deſire that their neighbours and acquaintance ſhould account them to be juſt in their dealings, ſkilful in their occupations, careful of their families, faithful to their friends, and grateful to their benefactors.

This general love of praiſe manifeſtly tends to the good of ſociety. This paſſion encouraged in all polite nations hath been one of the great ſprings and principles of uſeful and commendable actions both in the ſubject

[a] *Qua licet, æternus tamen es: quotieſque repellit*
Ver hiemem, Piſcique Aries ſuccedit aquoſo,
Tu toties oreris, viridique in ceſpite vernas.
Ovid. *Met.* x.

and

and in the magiſtrate. The deſire of reputation hath taught men to deſpiſe danger and to expoſe their lives for the public, to undergo labour and fatigue, to ſtudy inceſſantly, to deny themſelves many pleaſures; it hath made them deſirous of ſurpaſſing even the beſt and the moſt eminent. The love of reputation is neceſſarily attended with the fear of diſgrace and contempt, and the fear of diſgrace hath reſtrained ſome perſons from baſe and diſhoneſt actions, when no other tie would hold them, and religion itſelf was inſufficient for that purpoſe.

Thus hath this paſſion often proved advantageous to civil ſociety; for it has allured men to do thoſe actions willingly and chearfully which are never ſo well performed when they ariſe from compulſion; it has had an influence upon them when other motives would have failed, when there was no recompence to be expected, when their ſervices were repaid with ingratitude. The honour which men have purſued ſo eagerly coſt the public little or nothing, and yet hath been more valued than riches by thoſe who acquired it. A picture, an inſcription,

a ſpear, a crown of oak or of laurel, a ſtatue, a public commendation, — For ſuch recompences men have affronted dangers, and loſt their lives. They who love to ſet things in the leaſt favourable light, may compare theſe heroes to the ſavages often mentioned in books of Voyages, who exchange ſheep and oxen for a few beads or ribbands, or a bit of a looking-glaſs.

Reputation ſometimes brings with it ſeveral real advantages, and is more valuable to us in the effects which it produces, than it is in itſelf. A good character may ſerve to many uſeful purpoſes. It may raiſe us up friends, it may help us to acquire what is neceſſary for our ſupport in life, it may enable us to do ſervice to the unfortunate and the deſerving, by giving us credit and weight amongſt thoſe with whom we converſe; our example by being obſerved may incite others to imitate us; our reputation may be profitable to our poſterity; it may be both an advantage and an honour to them to have deſcended from us, and for our ſake they may meet with kindneſs.

We

We may obſerve farther in behalf of reputation, that to eſteem it ſeems to argue a good temper and a benevolent diſpoſition towards mankind. We pay reſpect and civility to our fellow creatures when we deſire their approbation, and take ſome pains to acquire and preſerve it, and ſet ſome value upon it. It is a ſign that we honour them, when we are willing that they ſhould honour us. On the contrary, they who ſlight reputation are uſually perſons who have no deſire of excelling, no induſtry, no ſhame, and whom it would be no credit to reſemble.

It muſt be acknowledged that there have been philoſophers, wiſe and virtuous men, recorded in hiſtory, who have profeſſed a great contempt for the praiſe and good opinion of others.

But either their meaning was, that a man ſhould perſiſt in his duty, and deſpiſe the cenſures of the ignorant and vitious multitude:

Or by condemning the love of praiſe they intended to condemn an immoderate love of

it, and a ſlaviſh regard to it in all our actions:

Or they had, amongſt many good qualities, a little pride and ſingularity, they deſpiſed too much the bulk of mankind, and therefore deſired not their approbation:

Or perhaps they expected to be admired on that very account, and to find eſteem by ſhunning it; as indeed it often happened to them, for [b] Reputation will fly from thoſe who purſue her in an improper manner, and will purſue thoſe who ſeem to fly from her, if they deſerve her favour:

Laſtly, they owned, that although the applauſe of the populace was of no value, yet the approbation of the wiſe and good was a thing deſireable.

Theſe few perſons excepted, the reſt of the deſpiſers of reputation have been ſuch as had no reputation to keep or to loſe.

The Stoics, a very worthy ſect, but ſomewhat rigid and moroſe, refuſed to give fame and glory a place amongſt good things.

[b] Καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα, καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει.

Yet,

Yet, I think, they did not ſlight the eſteem of good men. They were remarkable for logical ſubtilties, and as it happens to over-acute perſons, they ſometimes made a diſtinction without a difference: but upon this ſubject, they perhaps diſtinguiſhed well enough. They ſaid that there were two ſorts of reputation[c], the firſt was, to be commended of many, a thing of no value; the ſecond was to be commended by wiſe and good men, and this was what a wiſe and good man might willingly accept.

Another obſervation not to be omitted is, that in the ſacred writings a good name both during our lives and after death is repreſented as deſireable, and promiſed as a reward.

God with great goodneſs and condeſcenſion, makes uſe of various motives to excite our obedience, ſuited to the various diſpoſitions of men.

Of theſe motives to righteouſneſs the leſs excellent are thoſe which work upon our

[b] They called the firſt *gloria*, and the ſecond *claritas*. *Gloria*, ſays Seneca, *multorum judiciis conſtat, claritas bonorum.* —— [*ſed claritas*] *poteſt unius boni viri judicio eſſe contenta.*

fears, as the threatnings of preſent and future puniſhment; the more noble which are adapted to better tempers, are peace of mind, everlaſting life, and the beauty and dignity of virtue.

Of a middle nature between theſe two ſorts of motives is the promiſe of temporal bleſſings, a motive very well ſuited to perſons who have made a moderate progreſs in goodneſs, and deſire to improve yet farther. Temporal bleſſings are health, length of days, the conveniencies of life, liberty, peace, the proſperity of our families; and laſtly honour, praiſe, reputation, which are often propoſed in the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament, as a reward of well-doing and an encouragement to it: and our Saviour declares concerning the woman who anointed him, that what ſhe had done ſhould never be forgotten. Judas Iſcariot cenſured her for waſting the ointment, which, ſaid he, might have been ſold for much and given to the poor. Our Lord, who knew the diſhoneſty of the one and the good diſpoſition of the other, immediately took her part,

part, and kindly defended the action. "Why trouble ye the woman? She hath "wrought a good work upon me. For ye "have the poor always with you: but me "ye have not always. Verily I ſay unto "you, whereſoever this Goſpel ſhall be "preached in the whole world, there ſhall "alſo this, that this woman hath done, be "told for a memorial of her." Her action diſcovered a generous and a grateful mind; and therefore our Lord gave her a ſuitable reward, a reward very acceptable to perſons of ſuch a temper, reputation and praiſe, an honourable mention from his own ſacred mouth, which ſhould ſpread itſelf far and wide, and be tranſmitted down to the lateſt poſterity.

From theſe obſervations concerning praiſe we may conclude, that the love of it, if it be not immoderate, and leads us into no faults, is lawful; for ſince this love is natural to us, ſince the common intereſt requires that it ſhould be encouraged, and thoſe nations have flouriſhed moſt in which praiſe and honour have been judiciouſly beſtowed and generally purſued, ſince the poſſeſſion of it

it may prove beneficial to ourſelves and to our friends and to our poſterity, and hurtful to none, ſince a deſire to ſtand fair in the opinion of others is a reſpect and civility paid to our acquaintance, to our fellow-citizens, and to human nature, ſince a contempt of reputation appears blameable, and often proceeds from very bad cauſes, ſince the holy Scriptures condeſcend to comply with our inclinations for it, and permit us to ſeek it, and propoſe it ſometimes as an incitement to virtue, ſince our Lord conferred it as a reward upon a grateful and a generous action, it ſeems to follow that it may be ranked, if not amongſt thoſe things which ſtrictly and truly deſerve to be called good, yet, at leaſt, amongſt thoſe things which are convenient, which may be in ſome degree eſteemed without any diſgrace to our reaſon, or injury to our religion.

They therefore may be ſaid to have gone into extremes who have called the love of reputation a diſtemper of the ſoul, and a weakneſs which it ought entirely to ſhake off. They had done better, if they had repreſented the bad conſequences of indulg-

ing it too far, and the neceſſity of keeping it in due bounds.

II. I ſhall then, ſecondly, endeavour to ſhew, that there is an immoderate love of praiſe, which on many accounts we ought to avoid or reſtrain.

The love of reputation is a paſſion, and as ſuch it may be carried to exceſs; but of all the paſſions it is perhaps the leaſt apt to miſlead us. A deſire to be eſteemed by good and worthy perſons incites us to imitate thoſe whoſe approbation we ſeek. The love of riches, the love of ſenſual pleaſures, the love of idleneſs and of everlaſting amuſements, the love of arbitrary power and dominion, theſe are the inordinate affections, and theſe the objects which ſeduce men from their duty, and from the way to eternal happineſs, and they loſe the race whilſt they ſtoop to gather up theſe golden apples.

But we muſt take care that our love of reputation be diſcrete and moderate, free from pride, affectation, vanity, forwardneſs, conceit, envy, detraction, and hypocriſy.

1. We

1. We muſt not love the praiſe of the world too much, becauſe we may not be able to acquire it. It is one of the temporal rewards of virtue; it is therefore, like other recompenſes of this kind, not univerſally beſtowed upon thoſe who deſerve it; it is uſually, but not conſtantly, given to the righteous; it naturally reſults from a laudable behaviour, but it may by interpoſing cauſes be ſtopped and prevented. Reputation is ſaid to accompany goodneſs, as its ſhadow; but the day may be overcaſt, and the ſhadow may diſappear.

Whatſoever is ſo far precarious, that after all our endeavours we may never obtain it, ſhould not be permitted to poſſeſs the beſt place in our heart. Now reputation is to be ranked amongſt theſe precarious things: with many virtues we may live and die almoſt unknown to the world. We ſhould the efore ſet no high value upon the eſteem of men, we ſhould be contented if they neglect us, we ſhould bear without uneaſineſs thoſe ſlights which our betters in all ages have experienced. We ſhould remember that thoſe good things alone are to be greatly prized,

prized, and deſerve our ſincereſt affection, which if we diligently ſeek, we ſhall certainly find, and which we can never loſe, except by our own perverſeneſs and miſbehaviour. Such are, for inſtance, the favour of God, and the approbation of our own conſcience. As they are infinitely ſuperior to reputation, ſo they offer themſelves to every one, and may be eternally poſſeſſed by thoſe who enjoy them: they lie out of the reach of envy and malice, of time and the world.

2. We ſhould not be overfond of praiſe, becauſe we may ſuffer in our reputation undeſervedly, and ought to bear it patiently. It is indeed ſcarcely poſſible that an honeſt and worthy perſon ſhould be generally diſliked; but his good qualities may be known and eſteemed by only a few friends, which is not what we commonly call reputation, whilſt he may be expoſed to ſlander, miſrepreſented by the envious, the ignorant, the credulous, the injudicious, the ambitious, the ſelfiſh, and the cenſorious.

3. Praiſe is often ſo ill beſtowed, that even upon this account it is leſs valuable than it would elſe be. Praiſe or blame would leſs

leſs pleaſe or diſpleaſe us, if we gave ourſelves leave and leiſure to cōnſider what ſort of judges they often are whoſe good opinion we ſo paſſionately deſire, and what ſort of perſons have their eſteem, and how uſual it is to pay more regard to noiſe than to ſenſe, to fancy than to judgment, to vivacity than to reaſon, to boldneſs than to modeſty, and to ſatyrical and calumniating wit than to candor and good-nature.

4. Add to this, that it is almoſt impoſſible to enjoy reputation in its full extent. He poſſeſſes a great reputation who is known to many, and eſteemed by all to whom he is known. Now this is an advantage ſo uncommon, that to expect it is folly: and yet this is what every perſon who is greedy of honour will deſire; but he may know, if he takes the pains to inform himſelf about it, that if there are many who ſpeak well of him, there are thoſe who deſpiſe or cenſure him; and as they who covet applauſe, have a quick ſenſe and reſentment of calumny or contempt, the reproaches even of a few may give him an uneaſineſs ſuperior to the ſatis-

ſatisfaction which he finds in the approbation of his friends and well-wiſhers.

5. Reputation may be hurtful to thoſe who poſſeſs it.

In bad times, and when they who are in high ſtations are greatly corrupted, and wicked men bear rule, it is a dangerous thing to be beloved by the public, and to deſerve it, and hiſtory will inform us of not a few who have ſuffered upon that account. Even in happier ages and better ordered governments, he who remarkably excels in any thing that is commendable, muſt expect as much envy as praiſe. Now envy, hatred, malice are more active than approbation and eſteem; and the moſt inconſiderable perſon, who could do us no ſervice if he were diſpoſed to aſſiſt us, may be able to do us a miſchief. We may be injured and hurt by ſpiteful adverſaries, whilſt they who favour us give us nothing beſides good words and good wiſhes, and ſtand quietly by, and ſay that it is pity, and that we deſerve better uſage.

6. We ſhould not be too fond of reputation, becauſe we may not only be diſappointed

ed and little eſteemed, but God may permit it in very kindneſs to us, and for our benefit, either to chaſtiſe us for ſome faults which we have committed, and to mortify in us pride and vanity, or to keep from us a reward which would ſpoil our beſt diſpoſitions. There have been perſons, who have ſought reputation by laudable actions, who have obtained it, and by poſſeſſing it have loſt in a great meaſure thoſe commendable qualities to which they owed it, in the place of which have ſucceeded intolerable pride, conceit, and inſolence, till at laſt they have outlived both their virtue and their character.

7. If by an exceſſive fondneſs of reputation we make it the principle and the end of our actions, it will certainly miſlead us, and probably give us much uneaſineſs.

Such a perſon, when he behaves himſelf well, does it only that he may be praiſed. He acts therefore upon mean and narrow views, without due regard to the will and approbation of God, or to the benefit of mankind, or to the decency of virtue, or to his own improvement and future happineſs.

He

He who is guided by no better motives will abſtain from thoſe good actions which conduce not to his reputation, or may hurt it. There are duties which ſometimes through the perverſeneſs or ignorance of the public are out of faſhion, and produce contempt or hatred. He who is greedy of applauſe will often neglect ſuch duties, and fall into reputable vices; he will never have the courage and the greatneſs of mind to purſue what is right through good report and through evil report.

This was the caſe in the time of our Saviour. Many there were who believed on him, but becauſe of the Phariſees, they did not confeſs him, leſt they ſhould be put out of the ſynagogue; for they loved the praiſe of men more than the praiſe of God. Others there were on whom this paſſion had ſtill a worſe effect, whoſe deplorable condition our Lord repreſents, and tells them the cauſe of it in theſe words; "I know "you, that ye have not the love of God in "you. How can ye believe, who receive "honour one of another, and ſeek not the "honour that cometh from God only?"

Therefore he declares the loſs of credit in a good cauſe to be great gain: "Bleſſed are "ye when men ſhall revile you, and ſhall "ſay all manner of evil againſt you falſely "for my ſake. Rejoice and be exceeding "glad, for great is your reward in heaven, "for ſo perſecuted they the prophets which "were before you."

An exceſſive deſire of praiſe, joined as it often is, to a fear of ridicule, or to falſe notions of honour, hath done inconceivable miſchief in the world. It hath kept multitudes from receiving or profeſſing Chriſtianity where other religions prevailed. It hath ſtirred up the ambitious vanity of princes and generals to wage unjuſt wars, and to ſpread ruin and deſolation far and wide; nor have there been wanting fools or flatterers to call it valour and heroiſm, though it deſerves no more applauſe than a peſtilence, a famine, a fire, an inundation, and an earthquake. It hath forced many perſons to engage in duels, who though they knew that it was not conſiſtent with Chriſtianity, and that a thouſand bad conſequences attended it, yet were weak enough to ſacrifice all

to

to the ſenſeleſs tyrant called Honour. It hath been the cauſe why many a young perſon hath pretended to be worſe than he really was, hath talked ſlightingly of religion, hath grown negligent of his duty, and ſo hath made an unhappy progreſs in all profaneneſs and immorality, becauſe he fell into bad company, and took his notions of politeneſs from them, and feared their contempt, and was deſirous to paſs with them for a man of wit and taſte, and freedom of thought.

He who hath his reputation principally in view, lies often under temptations to play the hypocrite, and to pretend that he poſſeſſes every excellence by which he ſees others obtain honour. By this vanity he may be induced to undertake things for which he hath no abilities, and to expoſe himſelf to inconveniencies, to ſhame and contempt.

He indulges a paſſion which may deſtroy his peace, and quiet, and perhaps treaſureth up to himſelf diſappointment and uneaſineſs. Praiſe is to him food and raiment, and for it he muſt rely upon the charity of others. He puts it in the power of a few ſpiteful or injudicious perſons to deprive him of ſa-

tisfaction, and then may have leiſure to repent that he did not ſet his heart upon better things.

A violent deſire to be obſerved and commended will ſhew itſelf in his diſcourſe and behaviour, and break out in little follies and indecencies which others will not be inclined to overlook and excuſe.

He who loves flattery muſt be very fortunate if he finds one to counſel him, and very poor if he finds not one to delude him. He will confine his favours to his flatterers, that is, to thoſe who may be ſecret enemies but cannot be true friends to him; he will ſhun and fear and diſlike thoſe from whom he might receive the moſt benefit; ſincerity and plain dealing will be unacceptable to him, reproof will offend him, and good advice will be thrown away upon him. He will think and ſpeak ill of thoſe who take no notice of him, or who are his equals or ſuperiors in uſeful qualities or in reputation. The love of praiſe, when it is diſcrete and moderate, is always attended with emulation and a ſtrong deſire of excelling; and ſo long as we can ſtop here, there

there is no harm done to ourſelves or others; but emulation eaſily and inſenſibly degenerates into envy and cenſoriouſneſs.

The world, with all its faults, is ſeldom ſo bad as to applaud vices; and St. Paul exhorts Chriſtians to follow not only whatſoever things are right, but whatſoever things are of good report; the love of reputation, therefore, if it be not joined to a bad diſpoſition, will ſcarcely of itſelf lead us to immoral actions. Yet the things which the world uſually admires and praiſes moſt, are not the things in their own nature the moſt valuable; they are thoſe bright abilities and fair endowments which are exerciſed about temporal objects, which relate to the preſent life, and terminate with it. Commendable as they are, they are not the one thing needful, they have no immediate connection with heaven and happineſs; it is well if they be no impediment in the way to it. On the contrary, chriſtian virtues are often of a more ſilent, modeſt, and retired nature. God and good Angels approve them, but the buſy world overlooks them. So that he who principally affects popular approbation,

runs ſome danger of living and dying well-known to others, and little known to himſelf, ignorant of the ſtate of his ſoul, and forgetful of the account which he has to render up to God.

From the foregoing remarks we may make this concluſion, that reputation may be numbered amongſt the things which are deſirable and advantageous. We may uſe all lawful means to acquire it, and to ſecure its continuance; and if we be careful and induſtrious in uſing the proper means, we have commonly a fair proſpect of ſucceeding. The caprice of the great and powerful cannot deprive us of this reward at leaſt. They can neither give it, nor take it away; and it is very well for the world that they cannot. The love of reputation, when directed by reaſon, is allowable; but reaſon muſt govern, and not be governed. Our love of it muſt be moderate: we muſt love it as a thing, which though pleaſant and profitable, is precarious, attended with ſome inconveniencies, not eaſily kept, and ſometimes undeſervedly loſt, and laſtly of no uſe to us beyond the grave. We whoſe con-

continuance here is ſo ſhort, are ſcarcely born for this world, or for any thing that this world can beſtow. Our reputation we can enjoy no longer than whilſt we live. A reputation after death, if it only begins then, is of ſmall value; it is like a favourable wind after a ſhip-wreck. When we go hence, what good can ariſe to our own perſons from it? Here we muſt leave it, and here it will remain and ſurvive for a greater or a leſſer number of years, as time and chance ſhall determine.

Good actions are a treaſure which we can carry hence with us. If we are ſecure of theſe, it is no matter if the world be negligent of us, and we paſs our days unregarded, and Poſterity know not that ever we had a being. Our virtues are immortal, and true honour will be their recompenſe, an honour which we ſhall receive from God, from holy Angels, and from juſt men made perfect, and which ſhall continue to all eternity. And this ſeems to ſuggeſt one reaſon for which we ſhould have ſome taſte, and entertain ſome value for reputation here, becauſe reputation may be part of our reward hereafter.

DISSERTATION V.

On the hiſtory and the character of Balaam.

AT VERI FRVSTRA IMPATIENS, ET MENTIS INIQVÆ,
LVCTATVR VATES, MAGNVM SI PECTORE POSSIT
EXCVSSISSE DEVM. TANTO MAGIS ILLE FATIGAT,
OS RABIDVM, FERA CORDA DOMANS, FINGITQVE PREMENDO.

DISSERTATION V.

On the hiſtory and the character of Balaam.

NUMB. XXII. 12.

And God ſaid unto Balaam; Thou ſhalt not go with them: thou ſhalt not curſe the people, for they are bleſſed.

THE hiſtory of Balaam, recorded by Moſes, is extraordinary in all its parts. It contains difficulties which have exerciſed the abilities and divided the opinions of religious inquirers, it hath been matter of cavilling and of ſport to unbelievers, and it affords moral inſtruction of great importance and of general uſe. Upon theſe accounts I ſhall endeavour to explain and vindicate

vindicate it, and then to make ſuch practical inferences from it as the matter ſuggeſts.

The firſt point which offers itſelf to our conſideration is, How came Moſes to the knowledge of all theſe tranſactions? I anſwer, that as there is no intimation given, ſo there is no reaſon to imagine, that he had his knowledge by revelation. He had it then by information, which he might eaſily obtain concerning an event in his own time, and in the neighbourhood. Balaam himſelf muſt have related to the Moabites what befel him on his journey; and when the ſpirit of the Lord was upon him, and he delivered his prophecies concerning the people of Iſrael and other nations, the Moabites, who ſtood by, took down his diſcourſes, or he himſelf might afterwards commit them to writing; and ſo they came into the hands of Moſes.

Balaam in his prophecies foretold the fate and fortunes of ſeveral nations, and many events which did not come to paſs till after many ages. His predictions have been [a] ex-

[a] Of this the reader will find a ſatisfactory account in Dr. Newton's learned Diſſertation on this ſubject, p. 114.

actly

actly fulfilled, and this is a ſure proof that he was a prophet, and that Moſes hath given us a faithful account of his prophecies. It ſerves alſo to confirm the truth of ſome extraordinary things in the character and the adventures of this extraordinary perſon.

[b] Balaam ſeems to have been a [c] worſhiper of the true God: he was a prieſt and a prophet, and he dwelt in Meſopotamia, by the river Euphrates, at a conſiderable diſtance from the Moabites. His reputation was great, and extended through the nations round about, and he was thought to have

[b] Joſephus, *Ant.* iv. 6. and Bernard's notes. Philo, p. 436. Origen *ad Num.* Homil. 13. &c.

Joſephus, in relating the ſtory of Balaam, makes ſome additions of his own, which is no uncommon way with him. Philo throws in many embelliſhments and amplifications, but he ſuppreſſes the circumſtance of the ſpeaking aſs:

et quæ
Deſperat tractata niteſcere poſſe, relinquit.

[c] Balaam, ſays Jerom, *primum vir ſanctus et prophetes Dei, poſtea per inobedientiam et deſiderium munerum, dum Iſrael maledicere cupit,* Divini *vocabulo nuncupabatur.* See Bernard on Joſephus, *Ant.* iv. 6. Le Clerc on Numb. xxiii. 7. xxiv. 2. and Whitby on 2 Peter xi. 16. who ſhew that he was a true prophet of the Lord.

ſuch

ſuch intereſt in heaven, that whomſoever he bleſſed was bleſſed, and whomſoever he curſed was curſed.

The king of Moab, therefore, terrified at the approach of the Iſraelites, at the rapidity of their conqueſts, and at the deſtruction of the warlike nations of the Amorites and of other people, conſulted with his neighbours the Midianites, what they ſhould do for their common ſafety. It was agreed upon that they ſhould ſend an embaſſy to Balaam, and prevail with him, by the force of intreaties joined to the ſtronger force of preſents, to come and curſe the Iſraelites in a religious and a ſolemn manner.

It was a general notion that the prieſts and prophets could ſometimes by prayers and ſacrifices, duly and ſkilfully applied, obtain ſuch favours from the Gods, and that their imprecations were efficacious. This ſeems to have been a very ancient notion, founded, it may be, upon the prayers, benedictions, and imprecations of the Patriarchs, of men who had the prophetic ſpirit, and foretold the fates of their poſterity.

Theſe

Theſe methods of applying to the Gods, and of execrating and devoting an enemy in time of war, were practiſed by the [d] Romans afterwards with great [e] ſolemnity, and doubtleſs by others. Thus ſome nations, wiſe enough in many reſpects, yet thought that the Deity could be influenced by ſuch artifices, and brought to hate one people and love another. The Gentiles beſtowing human vices upon their Deities, accounted them to be as ſordid as themſelves, and uſed to ſay, that gifts had a prevailing charm over Gods as well as over men.

This art of religious execration obſerved by Rome Pagan hath been kept up by [f] Rome

[d] Le Clerc on Num. xxii. 6. and on Geneſ. xiv. 19.

[e] Ταύτας φασὶ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰς ἀρὰς ἀποθέτους καὶ παλαιὰς τοιαύτην ἔχειν δύναμιν ὡς περιφυγεῖν μηδένα τῶν ἐναχθέντων ἀύλας. κακῶς δ' πράττειν καὶ τὸν χρησάμενον. ὅθεν οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσιν αὐλὰς, οὐδ' ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἀρᾶσθαι. "Has Romani arcanas et vetuſtas devotiones ea præditas "vi ferunt, ut nemo, adverſus quem conceptæ ſint, "evitare illas queat, nec bene cedant etiam concipien-"tibus eas. Unde neque qualibet de cauſſa has, neque "multos imprecari." *Plutarchus* Craſſo, p. 553.

[f] Here is a form of curſing, employed formerly by

Chriſtian,

Chriſtian, where the holy Pontif and his Eccleſiaſtics denounce the moſt horrible, in-

theſe ſpiritual fathers againſt unquiet and untractable children:

" By command of the Father, Son, and Holy " Ghoſt, of the bleſſed Mary, mother of our Lord " Jeſus Chriſt, of St. Michael, John the Baptiſt, and " of Peter and Paul, princes of the Apoſtles, of St. " Stephen, and all the Martyrs, of St. Silveſter and all " the Confeſſors, of St. Aldegund and all the holy vir- " gins, and of all other Saints whatſoever, both in " heaven and earth; we curſe and cut off from the " holy Mother the Church, him, her, or them that " have [*done ſo and ſo*] or have known thereof, or have " been adviſing, abetting or aſſiſting therein. Let " them be accurſed in their houſes, granaries, beds, " fields, lands, ways, country-ſeats, towns, and vil- " lages. Let them be accurſed in the woods, rivers, " and churches: accurſed in pleadings, trials, conten- " tions, and quarrels; accurſed in praying, ſpeaking, " and in ſilence: in eating, drinking, and ſleeping; " in waking, feeling, walking, ſtanding, running, " reſting, and riding: accurſed in hearing, ſeeing, and " taſting; accurſed in all their works. Let this curſe, " ſmite their heads, eyes, and their whole bodies, from " the crown of their head to the ſole of their feet. " I conjure thee, Satan and all thy black guard, by " the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, that ye do not " reſt day or night, till ye have brought them both to " temporal and to eternal ſhame, whether it be by " cauſing them to be drowned, or hanged, or devoured

famous, and prophane curſes againſt the diſobedient, againſt ſchiſmatics and heretics, with all the pomp and grimace of Paganiſm, and with the ſame efficacy and ſucceſs. Their Pagan anceſtors, to give them their due, were much more reaſonable petitioners, and only deſired that their enemies might be

" by wild beaſts, or torn in pieces by vultures or eagles, " or burnt with fire, or murdered by their enemies: " Make them odious to all creatures living: Let their " children be orphans, and their wives widows: Let no " man relieve them from this time forwards, nor have " any compaſſion for their fatherleſs children: And juſt " as Lucifer was driven out of heaven, and Adam ba- " niſhed out of Paradiſe, let them alſo be driven and " baniſhed out of this world, being deſpoiled of all " their goods and poſſeſſions, and let them be buried " with the burial of an aſs: Let them partake of the " puniſhment of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, of " Judas, of Pontius Pilate, and of all that ſay to the " Lord their God, Depart from us, we will have no " knowledge of thy ways. [*At theſe words the perſon* " *who pronounced the curſes extinguiſhed two burning* " *tapers, which he held in his hands, with the following* " *dreadful expreſſions*;] I adjure thee, Satan, and all thy " companions, that juſt as theſe candles are extinguiſhed " in my hands, thou likewiſe extinguiſh and take from " them the light of their eyes, unleſs they repent, and " make entire amends, and ſatisfaction. Amen. " Amen." *G. Brandt*, hiſt. of the Ref. Vol. i. p. 15.

conquered; but theſe pious [g] Chriſtians prayed for the eternal damnation of their adverſaries, and devoutly hoped that their curſes were ratified in heaven and in hell [h].

But to return to Balaam; that nothing ſhould detain him, the embaſſadors brought him preſents, and were willing to pay him before hand. Upon which we may obſerve that the temper of the Eaſtern nations and of the Greeks, was and is, in general, extremely mercenary. Ancient writers [i] ſhew it to have been ſo in various inſtances: the Pagan [k] poets have not ſcrupled to charge the

[g] The Athenian Prieſteſs ſeems to have had much better notions of religion, when being required to curſe Alcibiades, ſhe replied that her office was to pray and to bleſs, and not to curſe. *Plutarch.* Quæſt. Rom. p. 271.

[h] See alſo the *Annotations* to Brandt's hiſt. p. 7. I would not be underſtood to mean that ſuch forms of execration are now in uſe; nor I do believe that the preſent Biſhop of Rome would approve them.

[i] Homer's heroes are often ſordid and rapacious.

[k] Τὸ μαντικὸν γὰρ πᾶν φιλάργυρον γένος,

ſays Creon to Tireſias, in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, 1607, and Oedipus calls him,

μάγον — μηχανορράφον,
Δόλιον, ἀγύρτην, ὄσις ἐν τοῖς κέρδεσι
Μόνον δέδορκε, τὴν τέχνην δ' ἔφυ τυφλός.
Oed. Tyr. 395.

Τὸ μαντικὸν πᾶν σπέρμα, φιλότιμου κακόν.
Euripides *Iphig. in Aul.* 520.

Diviners

Diviners and Sooth-ſayers with avarice and rapaciouſneſs; and Balaam's character is manifeſtly of this kind, and he ſtands recorded as a man greedy of lucre.

Balaam then ſaid to the meſſengers, "Lodge here this night, and I will bring you "word again as the Lord ſhall ſpeak unto "me."

From this it appears, that the Prophet had been accuſtomed to revelations, and that he uſed to receive them in viſions, or in dreams of the night. The ſame appears in the ſequel of the ſtory, from his going aſide after the ſacrifice, to receive ſuch information as the Lord would pleaſe to give him.

"And God, (that is, an Angel of God,) "came to Balaam by night, and ſaid, Thou "ſhalt not go; thou ſhalt not curſe the "people; for they are bleſſed."

"Then Balaam ſaid to the princes of Ba-"lak, Get you into your land, for the Lord "refuſeth to give me leave to go with you." Hitherto he ſeems to have committed no fault.

Balak, however, being very desirous of the Prophet's assistance, would not acquiesce in the first refusal, but entertained hopes that he might still prevail with him by larger offers and more venerable embassadors, and promised to promote him to very great honour, and to do for him whatsoever he should require.

"Balaam answered the messengers, If "Balak would give me his house full of sil- "ver and gold, I cannot go beyond the "word of the Lord my God, to do less or "more." The answer was wise and religious, and thus far the man appears to advantage.

But he was staggered at this second offer, and told the messengers, that he would consult the Lord once again. This was a wrong step, for God had told him before, that he would not suffer him to go and curse the Israelites, and Balaam knew that God was not fickle and inconstant, and he afterwards declared as much; "God is not a "man, that he should lie; neither the son "of man, that he should repent: hath he "said,

" ſaid, and ſhall he not do it? or hath he " ſpoken, and ſhall he not make it good?"

Here then his corrupted heart got the better of his reaſon and his religion.

" And God came to Balaam at night, and " ſaid, If the men come to call thee, [k] riſe " up, and go with them; but yet the word " which I ſhall ſay unto thee, that thou " ſhalt do."

So he went; " And God's anger was " kindled becauſe he went, and the Angel " of the Lord ſtood in the way for an ad- " verſary againſt him."

Various [l] ſolutions, and not improbable, have been offered to reconcile this account, that God ſhould give him leave to go, and yet be offended at him becauſe he went. But the Angel of the Lord ſaid to him afterwards, " I went out to withſtand thee, be- " cauſe thy way is perverſe before me." Hence it may be inferred, that God was of-

[k] I, fuge; ſed poteras tutior eſſe domi.

[l] See a Pamphlet called *The caſe of Abraham*, &c. in anſwer to Chubb, who might have found himſelf confuted in it; but he was too illiterate and too conceited to feel it and to own it.

fended at him, not ſo much for his going, as for his going with bad views and for bad purpoſes. He went hoping to receive honours and rewards, and to do ſomething to deſerve them from the king; to try at leaſt whether he could by any means obtain leave from God to propheſie evil againſt the Iſraelites, and to reverſe the declarations which had been ſolemnly made to him, that the people were bleſſed of God, and that he ſhould not be permitted to curſe them.

In ſpite of this ſecond reprimand, and of the great danger of being ſtruck dead by the Angel, which he ſo narrowly eſcaped, when he met the king of Moab he did not act the part of a man of piety and probity, and tell him that the attempt was wicked and would be unſucceſsful, but ſtill left him ſome hopes. He was reſolved at leaſt to teſtify to Balak his zeal for him, and his good will to ſerve him. He offered up ſacrifices to God, namely ſeven bullocks and ſeven rams, upon ſeven altars, animals which were pure and clean, and ſeven in number, to ſhew perhaps that they were offered up to Him who in ſeven days completed the creation of heaven and earth,

earth, and ceaſed from his work. Thus he ſtrove to make God favourable to his requeſt, but in vain; for the prophetic Spirit came upon him, and compelled him to bleſs the Iſraelites, and to denounce woes to their adverſaries.

It was the opinion of the Gentiles, that if one victim proved faulty, or portended evil, another victim might have a more propitious aſpect, and be accepted; and this notion, doubtleſs, was encouraged by the whole order of ſoothſayers and ſacrificers [m], who got the more meat by it themſelves, and helped their friends the ſellers of cattle. Balaam here ſeems to have complied with ſome ſuperſtitious notions of this kind, and to gratify Balak and his own ambitious views, he repeated the ſame experiment of ſacrificing at different places, a ſecond time, and a third time, and ſtill with the ſame diſappointment. And ſo they parted equally ſorrowful and diſſatisfied, the king at loſing his hopes, and the prophet at loſing his reward.

Moſes reminds the people afterwards of this ſignal favour of God towards them.

[m] Le Clerc on Num. xxiii. 27.

" The Moabite, ſays he, hired againſt thee " Balaam the ſon of Beor, of Meſopotamia, " to curſe thee. Nevertheleſs the Lord thy " God turned the curſe into a bleſſing unto " thee, becauſe the Lord thy God loved " thee."

Joſhua reminds them alſo of the ſame event, ſpeaking in the perſon of God: " Balak aroſe and warred againſt Iſrael, and " ſent and called Balaam to curſe you. But " I would not hearken unto Balaam, there- " fore he bleſſed you ſtill: ſo I delivered " you out of his hand."

After Balaam had thus failed in his attempt, he tried another and a worſe method. He knew what had happened to this choſen people of God, who had brought them out of Ægypt, and protected and conducted them in the wilderneſs. He knew that they were fickle and ſtubborn, and apt to miſbehave themſelves. He knew that they were under a particular providence, and would be fortunate or unſucceſsful, happy or miſerable, according as their conduct ſhould be dutiful or diſobedient. He therefore laid a plot as artful as it was wicked, he coun-

counſelled the Midianites to ſend their women amongſt them, to invite them to their religious ſolemnities, and to try to draw them into fornication and idolatry, by which they would forfeit the favour of God, and make him their enemy. The advice was followed, the experiment was made and ſucceeded ſo far that twenty and four thouſand Iſraelites were cut off for their iniquity and apoſtaſy. Moſes hath expreſsly charged this contrivance upon Balaam: "Behold theſe (that is, the "Midianitiſh women) cauſed the children of "Iſrael, through the counſel of Balaam, to "commit treſpaſs againſt the Lord in the "matter of Peor, and there was a plague "amongſt the congregation of the Lord."

And St. John, in the Revelation, refers to this tranſaction, and ſays that "Balaam taught "Balak to caſt a ſtumbling block before the "children of Iſrael, to eat things ſacrificed "to idols, and to commit fornication."

To revenge this injury, the Iſraelites, at the command of God, made war upon the Midianites and deſtroyed them; and having found Balaam among them, they put him alſo to death. And thus the evil overtook him

him of which he ſeemed to have had a ſtrong foreboding, when he cried out, in the midſt of his prophecy, "Let me die the "death of the righteous, and let my laſt "end be like his." That is, May I be gathered to my fathers, at my own home, in peace, and in a good old age, which is the uſual end and reward of the righteous.

And now I proceed to conſider the things which befel Balaam on his journey, and which muſt be confeſſed to contain in them no ſmall difficulty. The [n] Angel appears in the way, the Prophet ſees him not, but the aſs ſees him, and endeavours to ſhun him, and hurts her maſter; Balaam is angry, and ſtrikes the beaſt; the beaſt ſpeaks with an human voice, and reaſons and expoſtulates with him.

That God is able to work ſuch a miracle, none but an Atheiſt can doubt. That he ſhould have done it for a purpoſe ſo ſlender

[n] The Angel who appeared to Balaam was ἀνθρωπος ὁ Λόγος, ſays Irenæus, in *Fragm.* p. 471. According to the ancient Fathers, the Λόγος before the incarnation never acted and appeared in his own name and character, but repreſented ſometimes God the Father, and ſometimes an Angel of God.

in

in all appearance, is a ſuppoſition which may perplex even a ſober and religious inquirer, and throw him into a ſtate of doubt and heſitation. The end and deſign of this miracle, as far as we can diſcern, was to ſhew the mercenary prophet, that his paſſions had blinded and ſtupified him, that he had not even the ſenſe and the diſcernment of a brute, and that it would be a dangerous and a vain attempt for him to pretend to prevaricate, and not to ſay to Balak what God ſhould put in his mouth. This might have been accompliſhed by other methods, and the ſame inſtruction given to him without changing the order of nature in this moſt ſtrange manner. But what follows is ſtill perhaps more wonderful; for the prophet, inſtead of being [p] terrified beyond meaſure

[p] Joſephus therefore adds that Balaam was frightned at the ſpeaking of the beaſt — ταραττομένῳ δ' αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν τῆς ὄνου φωνὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἔσαν —— But this is making hiſtory.

In Lucian, Micyllus the cobler curſes his cock, and threatens to kill him, for waking him ſo early in the morning out of a golden dream: but as ſoon as the cock begins to talk and reaſon with him, he cries out very properly, *O Jupiter, averter of portents, defend me!* &c. Ὦ Ζεῦ τεράστιε, ἢ Ἡράκλεις ἀλεξίκακε ——

at

at the voice and reproof of the beaſt, continues to be very angry, and threatens to kill her; which is downright frenzy, and the behaviour of a man altogether beſide himſelf, and as ſuch, incapable of correction and inſtruction.

One ſolution there is to theſe difficulties, which if it might be admitted would in a great meaſure remove them. I would by no means inſiſt upon it as upon a certainty, but yet it may be offered as a conjecture not forced, or improbable, or irreligious, or contrary to the reverence which is due to the ſacred writings. It is this; Balaam ſaw and

Somnium ſeu Gallus. The cock in Lucian is ſuppoſed to be Pythagoras in maſquerade, in a ſtate of tranſmigration.

Mirūm eſt prima fronte, ſays Le Clerc, *hominem tanto prodigio territum, loquente aſina, non prorſus obmutuiſſe; ſed ita reſpondiſſe bruto animanti, quaſi non tum primum cum eo eſſet collocutus. Sed* AUT INSANIEBAT, *aut neſcio quid de brutis ſentiebat, quod ſciremus, ſi haberemus libros*, &c. — *Fortaſſe tranſmigrationem mentium humarum in brutorum corpora fieri credebat*, &c. Ad *Num.* xxii. This account will by no means remove the difficulty, any more than the Remarks of Dr. Shuckford on the ſame ſubject.

did theſe things in a trance or viſion, in ſuch a viſion as other prophets frequently had on other occaſions.

Several conſiderations may be offered in behalf of this interpretation.

Firſt, it is no new opinion. Maimonides, a learned and judicious commentator, amongſt the Jews, and [p] ſeveral of his brethren have adopted it, as alſo ſome [q]

[p] Bernard, in his notes on Joſephus, inſults Maimonides and his followers, for taking ſuch liberties. Bernard was a learned man; but his judgment was not always equal to his erudition, and he is ſurely too warm upon this occaſion.

Hæc omnia Maimonides facta putat in viſione. Neque tamen ſimilium portentorum deſunt hiſtoriæ. Agnus locutus, Bocchoride in Ægypto regnante, apud Euſebium. Bos locutus apud Livium ſæpe, et apud Euſebium. Meminere et Plinius, Polybius, Plutarchus. Grotius ad *Num.* xxii. 22. Bochart hath collected examples of the ſame kind. Grotius might have added to his liſt Homer's horſe *Xanthus*, and Lucian's *Cock*.

Τὸν δ' ἀῤ ὑπὸ ζυγόφιν προσέφη πόδας ἀίόλος ἵππος
Ξάνθος. Il. T. 404.

[q] The author of the *Caſe of Abraham.* &c. hath propoſed this ſolution in a modeſt and ſenſible manner.

Cum dictio ſacræ Scripturæ ſit admodum figurata, ſty-

Chriſtian

Chriſtian writers, though indeed the [r] ſtream of interpreters runs againſt us. This may ſerve to take off the prejudice of novelty.

Secondly, this interpretation may be ſo ſtated, as not to deny and deſtroy the hiſtorical fact, but only to remove that part and circumſtance of it which muſt always appear improbable and liable to exception. For according to this ſolution, we may admit that an Angel of the Lord did indeed come to oppoſe Balaam in the way, and ſuffered himſelf to be ſeen by the beaſt, but not by the prophet, that the beaſt was terri-

luſque mixtus, res eſt judicii non exigui in ſingulis locis diſtinguere, qua utitur loquendi forma Spiritus Sanctus, quo genere ſermonis. Sanctus Petrus de Balaami Aſina verba faciens inquit, Jumentum mutum, humanas voces edens, inhibuit prophetæ dementiam. *Aiunt tamen Hebræi, hoc totum in* Viſione prophetiæ *factum eſſe: nec credunt fœdam beſtiam e rauco gutture emugiiſſe voces humanas; ratiocinatam præterea, et injuriam expoſtulaſſe cum ſuo domino.—Non memini ego, in hiſtoria ſacra, ullibi locutas eſſe beſtias.* Burnet. *Archæol.* p. 541.

[r] Amongſt theſe interpreters we find Le Clerc, who on ſo many other occaſions thinks more freely. If ſome of my learned friends prefer the common opinion, they have too much candor to take it amiſs, that I diſſent, or rather doubt, in a point ſo ambiguous, and merely ſpeculative.

fied,

fied, and Balaam ſmote her, and immediately fell into a trance or extaſy, and in that ſtate of viſion converſed with the beaſt firſt, and then with the Angel. The Angel preſented theſe objects to his imagination as ſtrongly as if they had been before his eyes, ſo that this was ſtill a miraculous or a preternatural operation. This [s] interpretation which I have here propoſed is a medium be-

[s] Mr. Waſſe, in the margin of Le Clerc's commentaries, writes thus: *In a Diſſertation printed in Germany, ſee* Memoirs of Lit. Vol. i. p. 39. *this tranſaction is pretended to be viſionary. But* 2 Peter xi. 16. *ſhews it to be real; which I wonder that author was not aware of.*

I have ſeen that *Diſſertation*, which is a ſlight and a fantaſtical performance.

Indeed the principal argument againſt this interpretation is taken from the words of St. Peter—"following "the way of Balaam, who loved the wages of un-"righteouſneſs; but was rebuked for his iniquity: the "dumb aſs ſpeaking with man's voice, forbad the mad-"neſs of the Prophet."

But ſince Balaam related it as a fact, and Moſes recorded it as Balaam gave it, and other prophets have deſcribed their viſions like real facts, and the moral uſe and application is the ſame either way, it is no wonder that St. Peter, mentioning the ſtory, did not meddle with the diſtinction between real and viſionary tranſactions, which concerned not his purpoſe in the leaſt.

tween

tween the ſentiments of thoſe who take the affair to have been altogether real, or altogether viſionary, and I think it hath ſome advantages over both.

In order to have an accurate notion of prophetic inſpiration and prophetic actions, it would be neceſſary that a man ſhould be a prophet himſelf: it is therefore no wonder if we cannot clearly apprehend how the Spirit of the Lord acted upon the prophets: but in the things which were ſeen and done by them, ſome were real and ſome were viſionary. Thus much is allowed on all hands.

Moſes ſtands diſtinguiſhed from all the prophets in this, that he had neither dreams, nor trances, nor viſions, but converſed with God face to face.

The other prophets received information and inſtruction in dreams, or trances and viſions. What a dream is, we all know: a viſion is a kind of waking dream, when a man with his eyes open ſees not the objects which ſurround him, but other objects which ſome ſpiritual agent preſents to his imagination.

Prophetic

Prophetic [t] dreams and viſions were ſo very lively, and affected the imagination with ſuch force, that the prophet himſelf could not at the time diſtinguiſh ſuch viſions from realities. Something of this kind we experience in our dreams and *rêveries*, which, when they are lively and active, affect us for the time like realities, and the mind is then ſo occupied with the viſionary object, the imagination is ſo buſy, and the reaſoning and reflecting powers are ſo languid, that we conſider not the marvellous circumſtances and the impoſſibilities which often attend our dreams, and which ſhew us, when we are awake, that they muſt have been dreams.

[t] See a treatiſe of Smith *De prophetia et prophetis*, c. v. and vi. It is inſerted by Le Clerc in his commentary on the prophets.

Sir Iſaac Newton hath an obſervation, which in the main is very juſt, that the old prophets often taught by actions, and our Saviour, by alluding to ſuch objects as preſented themſelves. Many inſtances of this I have collected in the *Diſcourſes concerning the Chriſtian Rel.* Diſſ. vi. But Sir Iſaac did not conſider, and I did not then call to mind, that ſome of thoſe actions mentioned by him were of the imaginary kind, and performed in prophetic viſion.

It is therefore no wonder if the prophet in a viſion [v] converſed with his beaſt, and was not ſhocked at its ſpeaking, as he would, if this had been real, and he in the condition of a man who is awake, and hath all his faculties about him.

St. Peter had probably experienced prophetic trances, and viſions; and we have an account of one viſion which was preſented to him, in which he beheld a ſheet deſcending from heaven, and full of all kinds of creatures clean and unclean. Afterwards he was impriſoned by Herod, and an Angel came and releaſed him, and he followed the Angel, and, as it is ſaid, wiſt not that it was true which was done by the Angel, but thought he ſaw a viſion. Here, as he could not diſtinguiſh reality from viſion, it is to be concluded that neither could he diſtinguiſh viſion from reality.

St. Paul had viſions at various times, and once he was taken up into heaven; but how

[v] This is what many a perſon hath experienced, and hath converſed in dreams with his dog and cat, and imagined

veras audire et reddere voces.

this was performed, whether in prophetic viſion, or in reality, and whether in ſoul alone, or in ſoul and body, he ſeems not to have known: "Whether in the body, ſays "he, I cannot tell, or whether out of the "body, I cannot tell; God knoweth."

All theſe things conſidered, it is no wonder if the prophets related their viſions in the ſame manner as if they had been real tranſactions. How then ſhall we diſtinguiſh the one from the other? and by what rule muſt we direct our judgment? The beſt rule that I can diſcern is this; when the thing ſaid to be done is impoſſible in itſelf, or not conſiſtent with the divine laws, or ſuch as may give needleſs ſcandal, or in appearance mean and abſurd, and expoſing the prophet to contempt, or contrary to the courſe of nature, and yet not anſwering any important purpoſe, or extremely grievous to the prophet himſelf, it is reaſonable to have recourſe to viſion, and to ſuppoſe that ſuch tranſactions were imaginary: and ſuch a ſuppoſal is ſo far from being an unwarrantable liberty, that it is, on the contrary, the moſt reſpectful manner of treating the ſub-

ject, and an endeavour to defend a good cauſe againſt the cavils of profane men.

For example: The prophet Hoſea is ordered by the Spirit to marry a common proſtitute, and accordingly he takes her to wife, and has children by her. This muſt have been a very grievous command to the prophet, and alſo a matter of ſcandal to the nation. The deſign of this unſuitable match was neither more nor leſs than to be a figurative and typical repreſentation to the Jews of God's judgments which would fall upon them. There is therefore good reaſon to account it a viſionary ſcene preſented to the prophet's imagination.

The prophet Jeremiah is ordered to buy a girdle, and to wear it, then to take a long journey to the river Euphrates, and there to dig a hole in the ground, and hide it: then, after many days, to go again and dig it up, when it was rotten, mouldy, and quite uſeleſs. This was to be an emblem of the corrupted condition of the Jews, and of their rejection; and this ſeems to be of the ſame nature with the action of Hoſea.

Again,

Again, Jeremiah receives a cup at the hand of God, and travels about with it to various and very remote lands, and makes the kings, princes, and nobles of Judæa, Ægypt, Perſia, Arabia, and twenty other nations, drink out of it. He is alſo ſent about in the ſame manner with yokes, which he was to put upon the necks of many kings. Theſe were deſigned to be figurative repreſentations of the divine judgments which would be executed upon thoſe kings and their ſubjects. No reaſonable man can believe that theſe actions were really performed: the impoſſibility of the thing ſtares you in the face; and therefore theſe are commonly allowed to have been viſions, and ſhould be a guide to us for the interpretation of other prophetic actions.

So alſo Iſaiah is ordered to walk naked and bare-foot for three years together, as a type and a ſign to the Ægyptians, with whom he did not dwell, and as a prediction of their captivity; which may juſtly be ranked amongſt prophetic viſions, even for the ſake of the grievous inconveniencies ariſing from the literal ſenſe.

The prophecies of Ezechiel abound with actions of this kind, which muſt be thus interpreted; as his eating the book which God gave him, his beſieging a pan-tile, and lying down before it three hundred and ninety days on his left ſide, and forty days on his right ſide, and all that time eating bread that was baked with dung. All this was done to fortel the dreadful calamities and deſolation of Jeruſalem, and muſt have been an imaginary ſcene, which anſwered the prophetic purpoſe as much as a real one, and was as much a prediction of things to come, which was verified by the event.

In the ſame manner may be underſtood his [w] ſhaving his head and beard, and dividing it into three parts, ſome to be burnt, ſome to be ſmitten with a knife, and ſome to be caſt away; for Ezechiel was a prieſt,

[w] Abſit ut Deus prophetas ſuos dementibus aut ebriis ſimiles reddat, eoſve dementium aut furioſorum in modum ſe gerere jubeat! præterquam quod ultimum illud præceptum Legi repugnaſſet. Fuit enim Ezechiel ſacerdos magnus, et propterea duobus illis præceptis negativis, de non radendo angulo capitis et angulo barbæ tenebatur. Proinde non niſi in viſione prophetica factum fuit. *Maimonides* Moreh Neb. P. ii. c. 46.

and

and the ſhaving himſelf in this manner ſeems to have been prohibited by the law of Moſes.

Many other inſtances might be produced from the prophetic writings, where the nature of the tranſaction induced the moſt reaſonable and judicious interpreters of Scripture to have recourſe to the viſionary ſenſe and to prophetic ſcenery: whence the concluſion ſeems to follow which we have been aiming at, that the affair of Balaam might have been of the ſame kind, and a mixture of reality, and of viſion.

If a man will allow, and muſt allow ſome of theſe prophetic actions to have been viſionary, and yet will not allow a poſſibility that the converſation between Balaam and his beaſt might have been of the ſame nature, ſuch a perſon will hardly be able to give a reaſon why he admits the one and rejects the other.

Let us conſider the alteration which befel Balaam's beaſt in a philoſophical way.

If you adhere to the letter, you muſt ſay that the aſs talked, and talked to the pur-

poſe, and reaſoned. She was * changed for a ſhort time into a rational creature, and then returned back again to her firſt condition. Is this probable or conceivable? The defenders of the literal ſenſe have granted that it is not. The aſs, ſay they, did not know what ſhe uttered, but was a paſſive inſtrument under the direction of a ſpiritual agent. They will not ſay that it was an evil Dæmon, and introduce Satan into the machinery; and it ſeemeth beneath the dignity of an holy Angel to enter into a brute, for a purpoſe which, though kind and good, yet might eaſily have been brought about by other methods. We do not find, from one end of the Scriptures to the other, that a good Angel ever acted in a manner ſo fantaſtical in all appearance.

Thus much for the hiſtory of Balaam. I muſt add a few words concerning its moral uſe. It ſets before us the infatuating power of ambition and covetouſneſs, and the folly and danger of ſetting the affections on the tranſitory objects of this life, and of ſacri-

* *Nunc animal compos rationis, nuper aſella,*
Rurſus et in ſpeciem fato revoluta priorem.

ficing

ficing religion and duty to dirty lucre, and to temporal advantages.

Here is a man who had the honour to be a prieſt and a prophet; who had a great reputation in the world, who probably was not young, and had the leſs reaſon to be anxious about rewards, honours, and promotions, who ſeems to have been a worſhiper of the true God, and not ignorant of the moral duties, but well apprized of the important truth, that to keep innocency and to do the thing that is right, will bring a man peace at the laſt, and that he who would die the death, muſt live the life of the righteous.

The Devil, in the form of money and preferment, comes and tempts him, and he is in danger of yielding to the importunate ſeducer. But God hath compaſſion on him, and uſes all the methods to ſave him that are proper to be applied to a free agent. He forbids him to go with the meſſengers, he aſſures him that his deſigns would not proſper; he ſends an Angel to meet him and to terrify him in the way; he compels him, inſtead of uttering curſes, to pronounce bleſſings upon the Iſraelites, and to foretel the

proſperity

proſperity of that people and the deſtruction of their adverſaries in ſuch expreſſions as plainly ſhewed at the ſame time that happineſs was the reward of piety and obedience, and that wickedneſs brought on miſery and ended in ruin. But all theſe kind warnings and corrections were loſt upon the prophet: vexed at his diſappointment, blinded by his paſſions, and deaf to the divine admonitions, he hardens himſelf ſtill more, till at laſt he acts the part of the Devil, and lays projects of ſeducing the Iſraelites from their allegiance to God, and then, inſtead of going home, he loiters amongſt the devoted nations, till deſtruction overtakes him.

The world abounds with perſons, who, like Balaam, are ſlaves to covetouſneſs and ambition, and who reſemble him more or leſs, according as theſe predominant vices are checked and counterbalanced more or leſs by religion and conſcience.

Some of them are quite eſtranged from virtue, have diſmiſſed all ſhame and remorſe, all moral ſenſe and diſcernment, and judge of good and evil by arithmetical rules of gain and loſs.

Others

Others are not ſo far gone: by the bleſſing of a proper education, and by a ſerious temper, they are confirmed in religious principles; the fear of God and the fear of man reſtrain them from groſſer enormities. Amongſt theſe you ſhall find perſons who have learning, knowledge, acuteneſs, dexterity, and induſtry. But the love of money and of power lies lurking at the heart, and betrays itſelf from time to time in actions ſuitable to ſuch mean motives, and miſerable views. In many inſtances they are able to practiſe what is barely honeſt, but never can they do what is truly great.

The worſt of all is, that theſe evil diſpoſitions are ſeldom corrected, but length of time, which weakens the bodily powers, rather inflames than leſſens the diſtempers of the ſoul. The man grows old, and his irregular paſſions remain young and lively; and this is moſt remarkably the caſe of avarice and rapaciouſneſs, which ſurvive the ſtrength of the body and the abilities of the mind, ſubject to no decay, and [y] curſed with immortality.

[y] — *Curæ non ipſa in morte relinquunt.*

The

The Goſpel, though it makes favourable allowances to human infirmities, and accepts of humble repentance and honeſt endeavours, yet holds no fellowſhip and makes no compoſition and truce with the worldly and ſelfiſh affections; it requires of all thoſe who would hope and expect a reward hereafter, to ſet their affections, not on things below, but on things above, that the heart and the treaſure may be in the ſame place.

DISSERTATION VI.

On the ſtate of the Dead, as deſcribed by Homer and Virgil.

QVALE PER INCERTAM LVNAM,
SVB LVCE MALIGNA,
EST ITER IN SILVIS.—

DISSERTATION VI.

On the ſtate of the Dead, as deſcribed by Homer and Virgil.

I.

HERODOTUS ſaith of Homer and Heſiod, that they were the firſt who *made a Theogony* for the Greeks, that is, who collected and drew it up into a kind of ſyſtem: Οὗτοι δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι, καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες, καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες, καὶ εἴδεα αὐτέων σημήναντες. "Illi fuere qui Græcis Theogoniam "fecerunt, deiſque et cognomina dederunt, "honoreſque et artificia ſeparaverunt, et fi-"guras eorum deſignaverunt." ii. 53.

To ſuppoſe Homer to have been the author of the Theology and Mythology contained in his poems, would be as unreaſonable, as to

to imagine that he firſt taught the Greeks to read and to write. As he lived in no barbarous age or country, but when the Greek language was poliſhed and copious, if he had been the firſt inventor and ſpreader of the fables which aſcribe ſuch wild inconſiſtency, weakneſs, folly, miſery, and [a] wickedneſs to the Gods, his works would hardly have been received by his contemporaries with favour and applauſe. We find that in the following ages, when wiſe men began to reaſon more upon theſe ſubjects, they cenſured Homer's theology, as highly injurious to the Gods, if it were underſtood in the literal ſenſe. But when Homer wrote he had ſufficient excuſe and authority for the fables which he delivered; and he introduced into his poems, by way of machinery, and with ſome decorations, theological legends contrived in more rude and ignorant times, and ſanctified by hoary Age and venerable Tradition. Tradition had preſerved ſome memory

[a] Æſchylus alſo, in his *Prometheus*, deſcribes Jupiter juſt as a Jew or a Chriſtian would repreſent the Devil, as a hater of mankind, and a tyrant void of all gratitude and clemency.

of

of the things which the Gods had done and had ſuffered when they were men.

I do not believe, ſays Iphigenia, that Diana delights in human victims,

Οὐδένα γὰρ οἶμαι δαιμόνων εἶναι κακόν.

" Neminem enim Deorum malum eſſe cenſeo."
Euripides, *Iphig. in Taur.* 391.

Ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς θεὰς ἅτε λέκτρ' ἃ μὴ θέμις,
Στέργειν νομίζω, δεσμά τ' ἐξάπτειν χεροῖν,
Οὔτ' ἠξίωσα πώποτ', ἅτε πείσομαι,
Οὐδ' ἄλλον ἄλλᾳ δεσπότην πεφυκέναι.
Δεῖται γὰρ ὁ θεὸς, εἴπερ ἐς' ὄντως θεὸς,
Οὐδενός· ἀοιδῶν οἵδε δύσηνοι λόγοι.

" Ego vero Deos neque connubia illegitima
" Amare puto, neque vincula a manibus ſuſpen-
" dere :
" Neque dignum hoc Diis judicavi unquam,
" neque credam,
" Alterum alterius dominum fuiſſe.
" Nam Deus, ſiquidem revera Deus ſit, indiget
" Nullius : Poetarum vero ſunt hæ miſeræ fa-
" bulæ." *Herc. Fur.* 1341.

— ἀπό μοι λόγον
Τῶνδε, σόμα, ῥίψον.
Ἐπεὶ τόγε λοιδορῆσαι
Θεὰς, ἐχθρὰ σοφία.

" Abjice mihi ſermonem hunc, os: quoniam
" convitiari Diis odioſa ſapientia eſt."
Pindar, *Olymp.* ix. 54.

Whether Homer [b] looked upon any of theſe theological tales as allegories, in which ſecret ſenſes were couched under a fabulous appearance, I ſhall not determine. Thus much is certain, that his Scholiaſts and Commentators have aſcribed to him many a ſubtle ſenſe which never entered into his thoughts. Thus, amongſt the moderns, father Harduin, the father of paradoxes, hath propoſed a conceit fantaſtical enough to be his own, but yet borrowed partly from others, and tells us, in his notes on Pliny, book ii. p. 113, 114. that the iſland Pharos, and all the iſlands mentioned in the voyage

[b] Ὁππότε μιν ξωδῆσαι Ὀλύμπιοι ἤθελον ἄλλοι — Veriſimillimum eſt hæc non ab Homero conficta, ſed ab antiquis fuiſſe deſumta philoſophis, qui elementorum mutationes, rerumque naturalium formandarum rationem, ſub hujuſmodi fabulis ſoliti ſunt docere — Strabo: Ἐκ μηδενὸς δὲ ἀληθῶς ἀνάπλειν καινὴν τερατολογίαν, οὐχ Ὁμηρικόν. — Τὸ δὲ πάντα πλάττειν, — οὐδ' Ὁμηρικόν. *Clarke*, ad Il. A. 398.

of

of Ulyſſes, are the whole habitable earth; that the river Nile, or Ægyptus, is death; that a day's ſailing means human life; and that the proviſion of water, which ſhips take in, is the portion of care and ſorrow which befals us in this world. All this is delivered with that ſelf-confidence and ſerene complacency which the happy author enjoyed, and of which it would have been a pity to have deprived him.

" Pol me occidiſtis, amici,
" Non ſervaſtis, ait; cui ſic extorta voluptas,
" Et demtus per vim mentis gratiſſimus error."

A learned country-man of Harduin's, who far ſurpaſſed him in good ſenſe and uſeful abilities, gave the public in his old days an ingenious but a very obſcene interpretation of the *Grotto of the Nymphs* in *Odyſſ.* N. an interpretation which neither ſuited his years nor his character.

As Homer is a writer of great ſimplicity, we may expect to find in him an account of the popular doctrines of Greece concerning the ſtate of the dead, with a few poetical embelliſhments; I ſay, few, becauſe the

popular and the poetical religion ſeem in his days to have been nearly one and the ſame.

I ſhall therefore collect what may be found on this ſubject in the *Ilias* and the *Odyſſea*, taking it for granted that they are both of his compoſition.

There are ſome lines in the Odyſſea [c] relating to the ſtate of the dead, which are not quite conſiſtent with the doctrines contained in the Ilias, and which on this and other accounts have been ſuſpected by ancient Critics: but the Heathen Mythology hangs together like a rope of ſand, or the dream of a drunkard.

I have ſometimes doubted a little whether the Odyſſea were Homer's, on account of ſome ſmall difference, either real or imaginary, of ſtyle and ſyntax; but as Antiquity hath generally aſcribed both poems to him, I chuſe to acquieſce in its determination, and

[c] Ἑρμῆς δὲ ψυχὰς Κυλλήνιος ἐξεκαλεῖτο
Ἀνδρῶν μνησήρων—

"Cyllenius now to Pluto's dreary reign
"Conveys the dead, a lamentable train," &c.

Odyſſ. Ω. 1.

ſhould ſcruple to deprive the venerable father of the poets of any part of his property;

" neque illi detrahere auſim
" *Hærentes* capiti multa cum laude *coronas*."

Pindar ſays,

Ἐγὼ γὰ πλέον' ἔλπομαι
Λόγον Ὀδυσσέως, ἢ πάθεν,
Διὰ τὸν ἀοιδοπῆ γλυκὺν Ὅμηρον.

Ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσίν οἱ πολλαῖς γε μαχανᾷ
Σεμνὸν ἔπεσί τι· Σοφία δὲ
Κλέπτει ποικίλοισι μύθοις. —

" Ego vero majorem arbitror famam Ulyſſis,
" quàm paſſus fuit, propter ſuaviloquum factam
" fuiſſe Homerum. Quandoquidem figmentis
" ejus volucri artificio grave ineſt quiddam: ſo-
" lertiaque ejus decipit ſeducens fabulis." *Nem.* vii. 29.

The Odyſſea is by no means unworthy of him, and if the Ilias hath more dignity, majeſty, correctneſs, fire, and ſpirit, the Odyſſea is more diverting and amuſing, and abounds more with the Comic, and leſs with the Tragic. In one point it hath the advantage over the Ilias, that the reader in-

tereſts himſelf in the fate and fortunes of the hero, and is glad to ſee him ſafe at home, and triumphant over his enemies; for the character of Ulyſſes, upon the whole, is inſinuating, amiable, and reſpectable, and he is repreſented as a Prince who ever ruled with juſtice and mercy, and was a *common father* to all his ſubjects:

Μήτις ἔτι πρόφρων, ἀγανὸς, καὶ ἤπιος ἔστω —
Ὡς ὅτις μέμνηται Ὀδυσῆος θείοιο
Λαῶν, οἷσιν ἄνασσε, πατὴρ δ' ὡς ἤπιος ἦεν.

" O never, never more let king be juſt,
" Be mild in pow'r, or faithful to his truſt!
" Since he who like a father held his rein,
" So ſoon forgot, was juſt and mild in vain."

Odyſſ. B. 230. Pope's Homer.

But in the Ilias, the hero is a boiſterous, rapacious, mercenary, cruel, and unrelenting brute, and the reader pities none of his calamities, and is pleaſed with none of his ſucceſſes.

HOMER ſends Ulyſſes to the infernal abodes,

Εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης.

Odyſſ. K. 491.

He represents this adventure, sometimes as an actual descent into Aïdes, and sometimes as a Νεκυομαντεία, an evocation of the dead to the confines of the earthly regions, and mixes both images together.

Ἦν δέ που τῆς Ἰταλίας κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Ἑλλάδα περὶ λίμνην Ἄορνον οὕτω καλουμένην μαντεῖον ἄντρον, καὶ θεραπευτῆρες τοῦ ἄντρου ἄνδρες ψυχαγωγοὶ, οὕτως ὀνομαζόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ ἔργου. Ἐνταῦθα ὁ δεόμενος ἀφικόμενος, εὐξάμενος, ἐντεμὼν σφάγια, χεάμενος χοὰς, ἀνεκαλεῖτο ψυχὴν ὁτουδὴ τῶν πατέρων ἢ φίλων· καὶ αὐτῷ ἀπήντα εἴδωλον, ἀμυδρὸν μὲν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἀμφισβητήσιμον, φθεγκτικὸν δὲ καὶ μαντικὸν, καὶ συγγενόμενον, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐδεῖτο, ἀπηλλάττετο. Τοῦτό μοι δοκεῖ τὸ μαντεῖον καὶ Ὅμηρος γνοὺς, προσθεὶς τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὁδὸν, ἐκτοπίσαι τὸ χωρίον ποιητικῶς μάλα τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς θαλάττης.

[d] "Dicitur et in Italia circa magnam Græciam, "non procul a lacu quem Aornon vocant, an- "trum fuisse fatidicum, cui homines præerant, "qui ab animarum evocatione, quæ ibi perage- "batur, nomen habebant. Huc qui oraculi "caussa venisset, precibus conceptis, cæsa vic- "tima, libaminibusque rite effusis, cujuscumque

[d] I found it necessary to mend this Latin version in some places.

" vellet, ſive majorum, ſive amicorum ſuorum, " umbram ciebat: quo facto, prodibat tenuis " anima, nec viſu facilis, nec cognitu, quæ " tamen et voce prædita eſſet, et divinandi pe- " rita; cumque de iis, quæ quærebantur, re- " ſpondiſſet, ſtatim evaneſcebat. Hoc oraculum " noviſſe mihi Homerus videtur, ſuumque eo " deduxiſſe Ulyſſem, quamvis poetica licentia " locum illi extra oceanum noſtrum aſſignarit." *Maximus Tyrius*, Diſſ. xiv.

Strabo ſays the ſame, v. p. 374. and Servius, on *Æn.* vi. 107. whoſe note is very remarkable, and who ſays that they ſacrificed human victims on this occaſion.

The ſtate of the dead is thus deſcribed by Homer:

The ſoul of man, ſeparated from the body, is [e] material, or clothed with a material covering and vehicle, but of ſo thin a a contexture that it cannot be felt or handled; it reſembles a ſhadow or a dream.

[e] The ancient Poets, ſays Cicero, *Ea fieri apud inferos (finxerunt) qua ſine corporibus nec fieri poſſent nec intelligi. Animos enim per ſe ipſos viventes non poterant mente complecti: formam aliquam figuramque quærebant. Inde Homeri tota* Νεκυία. Tuſc. Diſp. i. 16.

Τρὶς

Τρὶς μὲ ἐφωρμήθην, ἐλέειν τέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγε,
Τρὶς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν, σκιῇ ἴκελον, ἢ καὶ ὀνείρῳ,
Ἔπτατ'. —
Οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶνες ἔχουσιν,
Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τε πυρὸς κρατερὸν μένος αἰθομένοιο
Δαμνᾷ, ἐπεί κε πρῶτα λίπῃ λευκὰ ὀστέα θυμός.
Ψυχὴ δ' ἠΰτ' ὄνειρος, ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται.

Odyſſ. Λ. 205.

" Thrice in my arms I ſtrove her ſhade to bind,
" Thrice thro' my arms ſhe ſlipt like empty wind,
" Or dreams the vain illuſions of the mind.—
" No more the ſubſtance of the man remains,
" Nor bounds the blood along the purple veins;
" Theſe the funereal flames in atoms bear,
" To wander with the wind in empty air,
" While the impaſſive ſoul reluctant flies,
" Like a vain dream, to theſe infernal ſkies."

It retains the lineaments of the man, and appears in the ſame dreſs that the man wore in his life time.

Πολλοὶ δ' ἀτάμβροι χαλκήρεσιν ἐγχείῃσιν,
Ἄνδρες ἀρηΐφατοι, βεβροτωμένα τεύχε' ἔχοντες.

Odyſſ. Λ. 40. *et paſſim.*

" Ghaſtly with wounds the forms of warriors ſlain
" Stalk'd with majeſtic port, a martial train."

It

It retains the paſſions, affections, ſentiments, and diſpoſitions that it had in the body.

Οἵη δ' Αἴαντος ψυχὴ Τελαμωνιάδαο
Νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα νίκης —
Odyſſ. Λ. 542. *et paſſim.*

" Alone, apart, in diſcontented mood
" A gloomy ſhade, the ſullen Ajax ſtood."

Though it cannot be handled, it may be ſeen and heard, and it can converſe with other ſhades and with men.

It may be [f] raiſed with proper ſacrifices and evocations, by the permiſſion of the Deities who preſide over the dead. But it is a dangerous thing to have recourſe to theſe methods; for if thoſe ſurly Gods ſhould be offended, they may ſend a Gorgon, a formidable monſter, to terrify and perhaps deſtroy the bold adventurer.

Ἀλλὰ περὶν δὴ ἔπειτα ἀγείρετο μυρία νεκρῶν,
Ἠχῇ θεσπεσίῃ· ἐμὲ δ' χλωρὸν δέος ἥρει,
Μή μοι Γοργείην κεφαλὴν δεινοῖο πέλωρος
Ἐξ Ἄϊδος πέμψειεν ἀγαυὴ Περσεφόνεια.
Odyſſ. Λ. 633.

[f] Odyſſ. Λ. 21, &c.

" But

" But ſwarms of ſpectres roſe with hideous noiſe,
" And terror ſeiz'd my heart, leſt Proſerpine
" Should ſend forth Gorgon's head, a dreadful
" monſter."

So in the *Perſæ* of Æſchylus, Atoſſa raiſes the ghoſt of her huſband Darius by libations to the Earth, to the Dead, and to the Infernal Gods, and by invoking the Earth, and Mercury, and Pluto, that they would permit Darius to aſcend; who ſays when he appears, ver. 688.

Ὑμεῖς ὦ θρηνεῖτ' ἐγγὺς ἑστῶτες τάφου,
Καὶ ψυχαγωγοῖς ὀρθιάζοντες γόοις,
Οἰκτρῶς καλεῖτέ μ', ἐστὶ δ' οὐκ εὔέξοδον·
Ἄλλως τε πάντως χ' οἱ χθονὸς θεοὶ
Λαβεῖν ἀμείνους εἰσὶν ἢ μεθιέναι.
Ὅμως δ' ἐκείνοις ἐνδυναστεύσας ἐγὼ
Ἥκω.

" Vos autem lamentamini ſtantes prope tumulum,
" Et plangentes luctibus animam educentibus,
" Miſerabiliter evocatis me, aſt exitus haud fa-
" cilis eſt:
" Et præterea ſubterranei Dii
" Ad accipiendum, quam ad dimittendum ſunt
" promptiores.
" Tamen ego apud illos multum pollens
" Venio."

The

The ghoſt likes to [g] approach the ſacrifice, and drink of the blood of the victims.

It is afraid [h] of a drawn ſword, and will not approach the man who thus threatens it.

It glides along like a ſhadow, and moves or flies with the utmoſt rapidity, and when the man dies, and it departs from the body, it ſoon gets to the regions of the dead.

Ἐλπῆνορ, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα;
Ἔφθης πεζὸς ἐὼν, ἢ ἐγὼ σὺν νηῒ μελαίνῃ.
Odyſſ. Λ. 58.

" O ſay what angry pow'r Elpenor led
" To glide in ſhades, and wander with the dead?
" How could thy ſoul, by realms and ſeas disjoin'd,
" Outflie the ſail, and leave the lagging wind?"

When a man dies, the ſoul quits the beloved body with much reluctance.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη ἀϊδόσδε βεβήκει,
Ὃν πότμον γοόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.
Il. Π. 856.

" He faints; the ſoul unwilling wings her way,
" (The beauteous body left a load of clay)
" Flits to the lone, uncomfortable coaſt,
" A naked, wand'ring, melancholy ghoſt."

[g] Odyſſ. Λ. [h] Odyſſ. Λ. 146.

It

It cannot enter into *Aides*, till the body be buried, or funeral rites have been performed in honour to it, but roves about at the gates, in a reſtleſs condition.

Ἦλθε δ' ὀπὶ ψυχὴ Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο,
Πάντ' αὐτῷ μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' εἰκυῖα,
Καὶ φωνήν· ἐπὶ τοῖα παρὶ χροῒ εἵματα ἕσσο.
Στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, καί μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν·
Εὕδεις, αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο λελασμένος ἔπλευ, Ἀχιλλεῦ;
Οὐ μέν μοι ζώοντος ἀκήδεις, ἀλλὰ θανόντος.
[i] Θάπτε με, ὅτι τάχιστα πύλας Ἀΐδαο περήσω.
Τῆλέ με εἴργουσι ψυχαὶ, εἴδωλα καμόντων,
Οὐδέ μέ πω μίσγεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἐῶσιν·
Ἀλλ' αὖτως ἀλάλημαι ἀν' εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄϊδος δῶ.
Καί μοι δὸς τὴν χεῖρ' ὀλοφύρομαι· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' αὖτις
Νίσομαι ἐξ Ἀΐδαο, ἐπήν με πυρὸς λελάχητε.

Il. Ψ. 65.

" When lo! the ſhade before his cloſing eyes,
" Of ſad Patroclus roſe, or ſeem'd to riſe;
" In the ſame robe he living wore, he came,
" In ſtature, voice, and pleaſing look the ſame.
" The form familiar hover'd o'er his head,
" And ſleeps Achilles, thus the phantom ſaid,
" Sleeps my Achilles, his Patroclus dead?

[i] I think the comma ſhould be, as I have placed it, after Θάπτε με, and not after ὅτι πάχιστα. See Clarke's note.

" Living,

" Living, I ſeem'd his deareſt, tend'reſt care;
" But now forgot, I wander in the air.
" Let my pale corſe the rites of burial know,
" And give me entrance in the realms below.
" Till then the ſpirit finds no reſting place,
" But here and there th' unbodied ſpectres chace
" The vagrant dead about the dark abode,
" Forbid to croſs th' irremeable flood.
" Now give thy hand; for to the farther ſhore
" When once we paſs, the ſoul returns no more.
" When once the laſt funereal flames aſcend,
" No more ſhall meet, Achilles and his friend."

The account which Homer gives of Hercules, amongſt the dead, is remarkable. Ulyſſes converſes, not with *him*, but with his *image* or *ſhade*. Odyſſ. Λ. 600.

Τὸν δ' μετ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακληείην,
Εἴδωλον· αὐτὸς δ' μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι
Τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς, καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην.

" I alſo beheld Hercules, that is to ſay, his
" *idolum*; for himſelf feaſts amongſt the im-
" mortal Gods, and is wedded to fair Hebe."

But the caſe of this Hero was ſingular; he was the favourite ſon of Jupiter, and after his death he was deified, and therefore Homer

Homer divides him into two perſons: his ſoul is a God amongſt the Gods, and his ſhadow or image dwells in Aïdes. It doth not appear that Homer thought other men to conſiſt, like him, of a σῶμα, a ψυχὴ, and an εἴδωλον, but in them the ψυχὴ and the εἴδωλον were one and the ſame.

This fable of *Hercules* and his *idolum* is ridiculed by Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* xvi. It ſeems to have produced another fable of *Helena* and her *image*, which is the ſubject of a tragedy of Euripides.

The ſhades form themſelves [k] into little ſocieties, and keep company with their country-men, friends, and acquaintances. Something of this kind ſeems to be implied in the phraſe uſed in Scripture of the dead being *gathered to their fathers*. Jacob refuſed to be comforted, and ſaid, *I will go down into Hades, to my ſon, mourning. I ſhall go to him*, ſays David of his dead child, *but he ſhall not return to me.*

The unfortunate Ovid, alluding to theſe notions, and dwelling in exile amongſt Bar-

[k] Odyſſ. λ.

barians,

barians, was afraid of having his lot and department amongſt them in another world alſo, which made him earneſtly wiſh for annihilation, in theſe melancholy, and pathetic lines:

" Atque utinam pereant animæ cum corpore
" noſtræ,
" Effugiatque avidos pars mihi nulla rogos!
" Nam ſi morte carens vacuam volat altus in auram
" Spiritus, et Samii ſunt rata dicta ſenis,
" Inter Sarmaticas Romana vagabitur umbras,
" Perque feros manes hoſpita ſemper erit."

Triſt. iii. 59.

This earth which we inhabit is a wide-extended plain, all hollow underneath, and there is Aïdes, or the region of the dead:

(Aïdes or Hades is properly the name of a perſon, of Pluto, and εἰς Ἀΐδα is an ellipſis in which οἶκον is underſtood: but it is uſed alſo for the place, for the infernal regions, and I take leave to uſe it ſo.)

Ἔδδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀϊδωνεὺς,
Δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνα ἆλτο, κὴ ἴαχε. μή οἱ ὕπερθε
Γαῖαν ἀναῤῥήξειε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,
Οἰκία ἤ θνητοῖσι κὴ ἀθανάτοισι φανείη
Σμερδαλέ', ἐυρώεντα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.

Il. Υ. 61.

" Deep in the diſmal regions of the dead,
" Th' infernal monarch rear'd his horrid head,
" Leap'd from his throne, leſt Neptune's arm
" ſhould lay
" His dark dominions open to the day,
" And pour in light on Pluto's drear abodes,
" Abhorr'd by men, and dreadful ev'n to gods."

As deep beneath theſe manſions as the earth is beneath the heavens, lies Tartarus, where Saturn, Iapetus, and other ancient Gods are confined, and never ſee the cheerful light of the ſun, or feel the refreſhing breezes of the air.

Ἦ μιν ἐλὼν ῥίψω ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα,
Τῆλε μάλ', ἦχι βάθιστον ὑπὸ χθονός ἐστι βέρεθρον,
Ἔνθα σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδὸς,
Τόσσον ἔνερθ' ἀΐδεω, ὅσσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης.
Il. Θ. 13.

" Or far, oh far from ſteep Olympus thrown,
" Low in the deep Tartarean gulf ſhall groan,
" With [1] burning chains fix'd to the brazen
" floors,
" And lock'd by hell's inexorable doors;
" As far beneath th' infernal centre hurl'd,
" As from that centre to th' æthereal world."

[1] Homer hath no *burning chains.*

—Οὐδ' εἴ κε τὰ νείατα πείραθ' ἵκηαι
Γαίης καὶ πόντοιο, ἵν' Ἰαπετός τε Κρόνος τε
Ἥμενοι, οὔτ' αὐγῆς ὑπερίονος ἠελίοιο
Τέρπονθ', οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι· βαθὺς δέ τε Τάρταρος
ἀμφίς. *Il.* Θ. 478.

" Fly, if thou wilt, to earth's remoteſt bound,
" Where on her utmoſt verge the ſeas reſound;
" Where curs'd Iapetus and Saturn dwell,
" Faſt by the brink, within the ſteams of hell;
" No ſun e'er gilds the gloomy horrors there,
" No cheerful gales refreſh the lazy air."

—Ὅτε τε Κρόνον ἀρύοπα Ζεὺς
Γαίης νέρθε καθεῖσε καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης.
Il. Ξ. 203.

" What time old Saturn, from Olympus caſt,
" Of upper heav'n to Jove reſign'd the reign,
" Whelm'd under the huge maſs of earth and
" main."

Ἀγρεῦ νῦν μοι ὅμοσσον ἀάατον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ,
Χερσὶ δὲ τῇ ἑτέρῃ μὲν ἔλε χθόνα πουλυβότειραν,
Τῇ δ' ἑτέρῃ ἅλα μαρμαρέην· ἵνα νῶϊν ἅπαντες
Μάρτυροι ὦσ' οἱ ἔνερθε θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες—
Ὣς ἔφατ'· ὦδ' ἀπίθησε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη,
Ὤμοσε δ' ὡς ἐκέλευε, θεὸς δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἅπαντας
Τοὺς ὑπταρταρίους, οἳ Τιτῆνες καλέονται.
Il. Ξ. 271.

" Swear

" Swear then (he ſaid) by thoſe tremendous floods
" That roar thro' hell, and bind th' invoking
" gods:
" Let the great parent Earth one hand ſuſtain,
" And ſtretch the other o'er the ſacred Main.
" Call the black gods that round Saturnus dwell,
" To hear and witneſs from the depths of hell.
" The queen aſſents, and from th' infernal bow'rs
" Invokes the ſable ſubtartarean pow'rs,
" And thoſe who rule th' inviolable floods,
" Whom mortals name the dread Titanian gods."

See alſo *Il.* O. 224.

Theſe Titans are called the parents of gods and men, or the moſt ancient of all gods, in the *Hymn to Apollo*, which is aſcribed to Homer. 335.

Τιτῆνές τε θεοὶ, τοὶ ὑπὸ χθονὶ ναιετάουσες
Τάρταρον ἀμφὶ μέγαν, τ' ἐξ ἄνδρες τε, θεοί τε.

Thence came the proverb, Ἀρχαιότερος Ἰαπετοῦ. *Older than Iapetus.*

But man is fond of variety, and the Pagans liked young gods and goddeſſes better than old ones; as in the Church of Rome the new Saints have often ſupplanted the ancient, and *Saint Thomas à Becket* hath received

ceived ten times more compliments and more preſents than *Saint Thomas called Didymus.*

Aïdoneus or Pluto, and Proſerpine are the formidable gods who preſide and rule over the infernal regions, and the Furies are their miniſters of vengeance,

— Ἀΐδης τοι ἀμείλιχος, ἠδ' ἀδάμαστος,
Τὤνεκα καί τε βροτοῖσι θεῶν ἔχθιστος ἁπάντων.
Il. I. 158.

" Pluto, the grizly god, who never ſpares,
" Who feels no mercy, and who hears no pray'rs,
" Lives dark and dreadful in deep hell's abodes,
" And mortals hate him, as the worſt of gods."

— συγερὰς δ' ἐπεκέκλετ' Ἐρινῦς.
— θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπαρὰς,
Ζεύς τε καταχθόνιος, καὶ ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνεια.
Il. I. 454.

" My ſire with curſes loads my hated head,
" And cries, Ye Furies! barren be his bed!
" Infernal Jove, the vengeful Fiends below,
" And ruthleſs Proſerpine confirm'd his vow."

Κικλήσκω Ἀΐδην καὶ ἐπαινὴν Περσεφόνειαν
Παιδὶ δόμῳ θάνατον· τὸ δ' ἠεροφοῖτις Ἐρινὺς
Ἔκλυεν ἐξ Ἐρέβεσφιν, ἀμείλιχον ἦτορ ἔχουσα.
Il. I. 565.

" She

" She beat the ground, and call'd the pow'rs be-
" neath
" On her own ſon to wreak her brother's death:
" Hell heard her curſes from the realms profound,
" And the red fiends that walk the nightly round."

Cerberus guards the place, and is called Pluto's dog, *Il.* Θ. 368. As to Charon, Homer, I think, never once names him. He is often mentioned in the *Alceſtis* of Euripides, 252, 361, 439. and in *Herc. Furens*, 432.

They who are puniſhed there, as Tantalus, Tityus, [m] Siſyphus, are perſons who had been guilty of particular impieties againſt

[m] He was ſo artful and inſinuating, ſays Theognis, that he prevailed with Proſerpine to let him return to this world again, after he was dead: 701.

Οὐδ' εἰ σωφροσύνην μὲν ἔχοις Ῥαδαμάνθυος αὐτῷ,
Πλείονα δ' εἰδείης Αἰολίδῃ Σισύφῳ·
Ὅσε νὺ ἐξ Ἀϊδέω πολυιδρίῃσιν ἀνῆλθε,
Πείσας Περσεφόνην αἰμυλίοισι λόγοις.—
Ἀλλ' ἄγε καὶ κακεῖθεν Σίσυφ' πάλιν ἦλυθεν ἥρως.

Where, ſince the firſt ſyllable of *Siſyphus* is long in all other poets, we ſhould read,

Πλείονα δ' εἰδείης Σισύφῳ Αἰολίδῃ.

and;

Ἀλλ' ἄγε καὶ κακεῖθεν πάλιν ἦλυθε Σίσυφ' ἥρως.

the Gods. Concerning the impiety of Siſyphus, ſee Munker on Hyginus, p. 108, for the Dictionaries are very deficient in this article. *Odyſſ.* Λ. 575, &c.

Hence, by way of conjecture and inference, it may be ſuppoſed that, according to Homer's ſyſtem, thoſe men alſo ſhould be puniſhed, who dared to burn or rob temples, to deſtroy the images of the gods, to ſpoil pious pilgrims, and thoſe who came with oblations, or to inſult and miſuſe the prieſts.

There is only one crime ſpecified in Homer for which men would be puniſhed hereafter, and that crime is perjury.

— καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμόντας
Ἀνθρώπους τίννυσθον, ὅ,τίς κ' ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.

Theſe Gods, ſays a Scholiaſt, are two, Pluto and Proſerpine: for the poet uſeth the dual number, τίννυσθον. *Il.* Γ. 279.

" Infernal Furies, and Tartarean gods,
" Who rule the dead, and horrid woes prepare
" For perjur'd kings, and all who falſely ſwear."

The office of puniſhing perjury is given to the Furies.

— καὶ

— καὶ Ἐρινύες, αἵ θ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν
Ἀνθρώπους τίνυσθον, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.
Il. T. 258.

Minos the ſon of Jupiter, ſits in Aïdes, as a judge over the dead, who plead their cauſe before him.

Ἔνθ' ἦτοι Μίνωα ἴδον, Διὸς ἀγλαὸν υἱὸν,
Χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχοντα, θεμιστεύοντα νεκύεσσιν,
Ἥμενον· οἱ δέ μιν ἀμφὶ δίκας εἴροντο ἄνακτα,
Ἥμενοι, ἑστάοτες τε κατ' εὐρυπυλὲς Ἄϊδος δῶ.
Odyſſ. Λ. 567.

" High on a throne, tremendous to behold,
" Stern Minos waves a mace of burniſh'd gold;
" Around ten thouſand thouſand ſpectres ſtand
" Thro' the wide dome of Dis, a trembling band.
" Still as they plead, the fatal lots he rowls—

This looks a little as if puniſhments were allotted, not only to the perjured, but to all wicked perſons in Aïdes; yet ſo important a doctrine deſerved to be more clearly delivered.

Aïdes, or the region of the dead, is repreſented by Homer as a gloomy [n] melan-

[n] Tireſias calls it ἀτερπέα χώρον. Odyſſ. Λ. 93.

choly place, where there is no joy and contentment, and where even the heroes are disconsolate and out of humour with their condition. Achilles says to Ulysses,

Μὴ δή μοι θάνατόν γε παραύδα, φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ.
Βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θητεύεμεν ἄλλῳ
Ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίοτος πολὺς εἴη,
Ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

Odyss. Λ. 487.

"Talk not of ruling in this dol'rous gloom,
"Nor think vain words (he cry'd) can ease my
"doom:
"Rather I chuse laboriously to bear
"A weight of woes, and breath the vital air,
"A slave to some poor hind that toils for bread,
"Than reign the sceptered monarch of the dead."

But, considering the disposition and the character of Achilles, he could not be happy in a state which deprived him of his usual occupations. Homer, however, with much art, contrives to dismiss this hero in better temper, and not a little pleased with the account which Ulysses gave him of the courage and prosperity of his son Neoptolemus. Λ. 537.

Ὡς

Ὣς ἐφάμην· ψυχὴ δὲ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο
Φοίτα, μακρὰ βιβῶσα, κατ' ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα,
Γηθοσύνη, ὅ οἱ ἦϊν ἔφην ἀριδείκετον εἶναι.

" Sic dixi: anima autem velocis Æacidæ
" Abiit, magnis paſſibus gradiens per herboſum
" pratum,
" Læta, quòd ei dixiſſem filium ejus egregium
" eſſe."

Homer wrote before the Greek philoſophy was cultivated, and we find in his doctrine of the ſoul no metaphyſical ſpeculations, nothing concerning the immateriality of the ſoul, or its præexiſtence, or its paſt eternity, or its tranſmigration, or its being a portion of the Soul of the world, or of the Deity.

His notions of the ſoul ſeem not to be the reſult of reaſonings upon the nature of God or of man; but the remains of an old tradition, delivered down, in all probability, from the beginning of the world, and ſpread through all nations. The ancient fable of Pluto, as Le Clerc ſomewhere obſerves, is a probable proof that, before the days of this ſon of Saturn, it was an opinion commonly

received, that the ſouls of men, after death, went to ſubterraneous abodes.

His deſcription of the dead is ſo uncomfortable, that it was not at all calculated to inſpire either courage or virtue; but rather to make men poltroons, and knaves. Therefore the learned Greeks and the Poets in the following times mended that part of his ſyſtem, and gave more encouragement to valour, to probity, and to ° piety.

And yet, even in Homer's gloomy ſyſtem, the ſouls in the ſtate of ſeparation ſeem in ſome few reſpects to approach rather nearer to the divine nature than they did when they inhabited the body. They move with the ſwiftneſs of a Deity, and they ſubſiſt and act and converſe without ſtanding in need of raiment, food, drink, or ſleep. The ſubſtance alſo of which the ſoul is compoſed ſeems to be like that of the gods, and to partake of immortality.

° Piety, ſaith Sophocles, doth not die along with good men, but,

Κἂν ζῶσι, κἂν θάνωσιν, οὐκ ἀπόλλυται.

" Et, ſeu vivant, ſeu moriantur, numquam perit."

Philoct. 1490.

Homer's

Homer's gods eat ambroſia and drink nectar; but it ſeems that they can live without it, for Saturn and the other gods in Tartarus have nothing to eat or drink, and Mars was thirteen months kept in priſon and in fetters by two furious giants, who hardly gave him even the jail allowance of bread and water.

Yet they can at pleaſure aſſume an human ſhape and body, and then they can eat and drink like human creatures, and perform τὰ ἀφροδίσια,

"And works of *love* or enmity fulfil."

So Angels alſo are repreſented ſometimes in the Old Teſtament, as appearing in an human ſhape, and eating and drinking. *Geneſ.* xviii. 8. xix. 3. The author of the book of *Tobit* philoſophizes upon the occaſion, and makes his Angel ſay; *All theſe days I did appear unto you; but I did neither eat nor drink, but you did ſee a viſion.*

Heſiod, in thoſe poems of his which are extant, is ſilent about a ſtate of retribution. He, indeed, hath a Tartarus wherein the Titans are confined, and an Aïdes, as well as Homer.

Homer. He alſo ſpeaks of the men of the golden age as of perſons who after their deceaſe became good Dæmons, a kind of leſſer gods, and tutelar Deities to men; and of thoſe of the ſilver age as obtaining ſome honours likewiſe after death; and of the heroes of the fourth age, as being removed, when they left this world, to the Fortunate iſlands: but he never affirms, or even intimates, that he and his contemporaries had any rewards to expect, or any puniſhments to fear in a future ſtate. Ἐργ. 121, &c.

If Heſiod wrote *the deſcent of Theſeus to Hades*, which is aſcribed to him by Pauſanias, *Boeot.* p. 772, and if that work were extant, we might perhaps find ſomething concerning his notions of the ſtate of the dead. In all likelihood they very much reſembled thoſe of Homer.

In Homer we find puniſhments expreſſly threatned only to the perjured, and indirectly to the wicked, and rewards promiſed to none; unleſs perhaps, by way of inference, we ſhould allow to his virtuous ſhades the poor negative rewards of not being tormented with Tantalus and Tityus:

" Non

"Non Divos læſi. Non paſces in cruce corvos."

There are no pleaſures and no rewards to be found in Homer's Aïdes.

But Homer's Elyſium is no gloomy and melancholy place, and muſt not be confounded with his Aïdes, his ἀϊδόφελος λεμὼν, his regions of the dead. It is impoſſible that the Greek Elyſium ſhould be a diſagreeable abode. Whence had Virgil his fair ideas of Elyſium? He will tell you himſelf, that he had them from the Greeks.

"Quamvis Elyſios miretur Græcia campos."

Homer, in his *Odyſſea*, Δ. 561. hath deſcribed Elyſium accidentally, and *en paſſant*, where Proteus conſulted by Menelaus, tells him his fortune, and thus concludes; "It "is not decreed for you, O Menelaus, to "end your days and die in Argos; but the "immortal Gods will ſend you to the ex-"tremities of the earth, to the Elyſian fields, "where dwells Rhadamanthus, where men "live at their eaſe[p], where there is no coarſe

[p] The Eſſenes, if we may believe Joſephus, adopted Homer's account of Elyſium, and made that happy weather,

" weather, no ſnow, no ſhowers, but " where the ſoft Zephyrs blow from off the " ocean, to refreſh the inhabitants. Thither " the gods will ſend you, becauſe you are " the huſband of Helena, and the ſon in " law of Jupiter."

[q] Σοὶ δ' οὐ θέσφατόν ἐςι, διοτρεφὲς ὦ Μενέλαε,
Ἄργει ἐν ἱπποβότῳ θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν·
Ἀλλὰ σ' ἐς Ἠλύσιον πεδίον καὶ πείρατα γαίης
Ἀθάνατοι πέμψουσιν, ὅθι ξανθὸς Ῥαδάμανθυς,
Τῇ περ ῥηΐςη βιοτὴ πέλει ἀνθρώποισιν·
Οὐ νιφετὸς, οὔτ' ἂρ χειμὼν πολὺς, οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος,
Ἀλλ' αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγυπνείοντας ἀήτας
Ὠκεανὸς ἀνίησιν, ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους·
Οὕνεκ' ἔχεις Ἑλένην, καί σφιν γαμβρὸς Διός ἐσσι.

This is ſhort and ſweet, and all that he hath diſcovered to us concerning Elyſium; and from this curſory account we learn that

region the receptacle of the ſouls of the righteous. *B. Jud.* ii. 12. Concerning the real ſituation of theſe *Fortunate iſlands* ſee Plutarch in *Sertorius*, p. 572. Lucian did not forget to give a ludicrous deſcription of Elyſium in his *true hiſtory*.

[q] Euripides, *Helena*, 1692.

Καὶ τῷ πλανήτῃ Μενέλεῳ θεῶν πάρα
Μακάρων κατοικεῖν νῆσόν ἐςι μόρσιμον.

the

the Elyſian fields were ſituated beyond the ſea, and bounded by the ſea, and ſeparated from the earth in which others dwell. But we are not told who were the inhabitants of thoſe happy regions. Only we find that they were men, and not ghoſts; and from Horace we may conjecture that they were the men, or the poſterity of the men, who flouriſhed in the firſt and golden age of the world, and who were ſeparated from the reſt of mankind, when the next age enſued.

" Jupiter illa piæ ſecrevit litora genti,
" Ut inquinavit ære tempus aureum."

Carm. v. 16.

According to Heſiod, the inhabitants of this agreeable place were the heroes of the fourth age.

" Jupiter, ſays he, removed them from " the reſt of mankind to the iſlands of the " bleſſed, where they live without care or " trouble, near the ocean, and where the " fertile earth, thrice in the year, produces " pleaſing fruits for their ſuſtenance."

Τοῖς ὄ δίχ' ἀνθρώπων βίοτον κὴ ἤθε' ὀπάσσας
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης κατέναστε πατὴρ ἐς πείρατα γαίης.—

Καὶ

Καὶ τοὶ μὲ ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες
Ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην,
Ὄλβιοι Ἥρωες· τοῖσιν μελιηδέα καρπὸν
Τρὶς ἔτεος θάλλουσα φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.

Εργ. 167.

We may infer from Homer, that an admiſſion into thoſe fortunate regions, and a converſation with thoſe *happy men*, was the reward neither of valour nor of virtue; but granted to a few [r] ſpecial favourites of the gods, and to Menelaus, only becauſe he had the honour to be the huſband of Helena, and the ſon in law of Jupiter. Jupiter might ſhew him this kindneſs, in pity to him, and to make him amends for the bad preſent he had beſtowed upon him of his daughter, who had plagued him ſo much with her gallantries.

Pindar imitates Homer, in his deſcription of Elyſium, or the *iſland* of the *bleſſed*: but he hath in ſome points improved and mended Homer's moral and religious ſyſtem.

[r] In the *Andromache* of Euripides, Thetis promiſes her huſband Peleus to make him a God, and to ſhew him his ſon Achilles in the *happy iſlands*. Cadmus alſo and Harmonia were to be ſent thither. *Bacch.* 1336.

A good

A good man, [s] ſays Pindar, knoweth what will come to paſs hereafter; namely, that the ſouls of the incorrigibly wicked, when they go to the infernal regions, muſt ſuffer horrible puniſhments, to which they will be condemned by a juſt, an impartial, and an inexorable judge. On the contrary, the good will dwell there, with Pluto and Proſerpine, free from toil and trouble, in regions where there is a perpetual ſunſhine and ſerenity. But they who have paſſed through three tranſmigrations and trials, both here upon earth, and in the realms below, and have perſevered in their good temper and behaviour, will be ſent to the city of Saturn, to the iſland of the Bleſſed, where Saturn and Rhadamanthus preſide, where the refreſhing breezes blow from off the ocean, and where the moſt beautiful and reſplendent flowers adorn the fields and the trees, &c.

— Εἰ δέ μιν ἔχει
Τὶς, οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον, etc. Olymp. ii. 102.

[s] Plutarch hath given us ſome other paſſages of Pindar, which deſcribe the happineſs of the good in Aïdes or Elyſium. *Conſol. ad Apoll.* p. 120.

You ſee here, that the Pythagorean ſyſtem of tranſmigration had ſoon ſpread itſelf, and that Pindar made ſome uſe of it.

In the *Alceſtis* of Euripides, the Chorus wiſhes all happineſs to the deceaſed lady, in the realms below, IF any rewards are beſtowed there upon the deſerving, 743.

Χαῖρε· πρόφρων σε χθόνιός θ' Ἑρμῆς
Ἀΐδης τε δέχοιτ'· εἰ δέ τι κἀκεῖ
Πλέον ἔς' ἀγαθοῖς, τούτων μέτεχοις'
Ἄδε νύμφα προσεδρεύοις.

" Vale: benevolus vero te ſubterraneus Mercu-
" rius,
" Et Pluto excipiat: ſi vero et illic
" Plus bonorum contingit bonis, horum particeps
" Plutonis conjugi aſſideas."

Ἑλλήνων δὲ Ὁμηρος μὲ φαίνεται κοινῶς ἀμφοτέροις χρώμενος τοῖς ὀνόμασι, καὶ τὰς θεὰς ἔστιν ὅτε δαίμονας προσαγορεύων. Ἡσίοδος δὲ καθαρῶς καὶ διωρισμένως πρῶτος ἐξέθηκε τῶν λογικῶν τέσσαρα γένη, θεὰς, εἶτα δαίμονας πολλὰς καὶ ἀγαθὰς, εἶτα ἥρωας, εἶτα ἀνθρώπους· ἐξ ὧν ἔοικε ποιεῖν τινὰ μεταβολὴν, τὸ μὲν χρυσοῦν γένος εἰς δαίμονας πολλὰς καὶ ἀγαθὰς, τῶν δὲ ἡμιθέων εἰς ἥρωας ἀποκεκριμένων. — ἐκ μὲν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἥρωας, ἐκ δὲ ἡρώων

εἰς

εἰς δαίμονας, αἱ βελτίονες ψυχαὶ τὴν μεταβολὴν λαμβάνουσιν. ἐκ δὲ δαιμόνων ὀλίγαι μὲν ἔτι χρόνῳ πολλῷ δι' ἀρετῆς καθαρθεῖσαι πανταπασι θεότητος μετέχουσιν. — ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος οἴεται καὶ περιόδοις τισὶ χρόνων γίνεσθαι τοῖς δαίμοσι τὰς τελευτάς. —

"De Græcis Homerus videtur promiſcue Deorum ac Geniorum uſus nominibus, ut Diis quoque aliquando Dæmonum nomen impoſuerit. Heſiodus pure et diſtincte primus quatuor genera præditorum ratione expoſuit: primum Deos, deinde Genios, poſt heroes, denique homines. atque hinc mutationem inſtituit aurei generis in Genios multos ac bonos, ſemideorum autem in Heroes. (Alii ſtatuunt) meliores animas ex humanis in heroicas, ex heroibus in Genios mutari: e geniis quaſdam paucas, longo tempore virtutis ope prorſus purgatas, divinæ naturæ participes reddi. — Heſiodus vero certis temporum converſionibus mortem Geniis obtingere cenſet."— *Plutarch.* De orac. def. p. 415, et Xylander p. 15. To which may be added his treatiſe *De facie in orbe Lunæ*, p. 943.

If we conſider the doctrines in Homer concerning the ſtate of the dead, and compare them with the Old Teſtament, we ſhall find ſome reſemblance between the notions of the ancient Greeks (as alſo of the

Ægyptians) and their contemporaries the Hebrews, with relation to the evocation of ſpirits, the art of magic and necromancy, the apparition of ghoſts, the gates of Hades, the dark regions of the dead, and the ſhades dwelling together, according to their tribes and families.

The difference is this, that the Pagans had adopted fabulous traditions of the ſtate of ſeparate ſouls in Hades, and the Jews or Hebrews had no expreſs revelation concerning it, and therefore knew no more of it than they could collect from ſome hiſtorical facts contained in their ſacred books, from the nature of man, from the perfections of God, from the inequalities of providence in this life, from promiſes made to the righteous which did not receive their completion in this world, &c.

We may alſo obſerve from Homer, that the doctrine of the ſoul's ſeparate exiſtence, and of a future ſtate, is different from the doctrine of a juſt diſtribution of rewards and corrections, and that men might entertain the firſt without the ſecond, or at leaſt without

out any rational and consistent notions of a perfectly wise and good providence.

Homer hath not affirmed directly, and in so many words, that the soul is immortal; but this doctrine seems manifestly deducible from his system, and connected with it.

Pythagoras, as Maximus Tyrius says, was the first assertor of the soul's immortality; and Porphyrius and Jerom say the same. Others give it to Pherecydes, or to Thales.

Πυθαγόρας ἦ ὁ Σάμιος πρῶτος ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι αὐτῷ τὸ μὲν σῶμα τεθνήξεται, ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ ἀνάπλασα οἰχήσεται ἀθανὴς καὶ ἀγήρως· ἔστι γὰρ εἶναι αὐτὴν, πρὶν ἥκειν δεῦρο.

"Primus vero Pythagoras Samius dicere ausus "est, interiturum esse corpus suum, animam "vero mortis immunem, seniique, evolaturam "esse; priusquam enim huc veniret, extitisse "olim." *Dissertat.* xvi.

It gives us pleasure to trace in this most ancient poet the important doctrines of a supreme God, a providence, a free-agency in man, supposed to be consistent with fate, or destiny, or prescience, a difference between moral good and evil, inferior Gods, or

Angels in the Jewiſh and Chriſtian ſyſtem, ſome favourable to men, others malevolent, and the immortality of the ſoul: but it gives us pain to find theſe notions ſo miſerably corrupted, that they muſt have had a very weak influence, to excite men to virtue, and to deter them from vice.

II.

HOMER having ſent Ulyſſes to the regions of the dead, to raiſe the ghoſt of Tireſias, and to conſult with him how he ſhould ſettle his domeſtic affairs and overcome his enemies, VIRGIL imitates his great maſter, and ſends Æneas to the infernal regions on much the ſame errand, to adviſe with his father Anchiſes; and upon this plan he hath contrived the ſixth book, which is the moſt reſplendent part of the Æneis; for if Virgil any where ſurpaſſeth Homer, it is here. Here he hath taken an opportunity, as alſo in the *ſhield* of Æneas, to compliment Auguſtus, and other great men who adorn the Roman annals. Here he hath alſo given a more elegant and poetical account of the ſtate of the dead, by adopting in ſome meaſure

meaſure the Pythagorean and the Platonic philoſophy.

ÆNEAS is deſcribed as an accompliſhed Hero, and under his character that of Auguſtus is frequently delineated, as his [t] *fidus Achates* repreſents Mecænas. This is one reaſon for which the poets of that age extolled the *Æneis* ſo much, to make their court to Auguſtus and his family. This made Ovid ſay to Auguſtus,

" Et tamen ille TV Æ felix Æneidos auctor
" Contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros."
Triſt. ii. 533.

And Virgil in his *Dedicatio Æneidos*, (if that little and elegant poem be his) repreſents Cæſar as concerned no leſs than himſelf in the ſucceſs of that work:

" Si mihi ſuſceptum fuerit decurrere munus,
" O Paphon, o ſedes quæ colis Idalias, &c.
" Adſis, o Cytherea: tuus te Cæſar Olympo,
" Et Surrentini litoris ora vocat."

The reſemblance between Æneas and Auguſtus hath been obſerved by others. I ſhall

[t] Mæcenas was to Auguſtus, ſays Propertius, ii. 1.
" Et ſumta, et poſita pace, fidele caput.

only mention one or two particularities relating to it which have occurred to me.

Æneas is repreſented in Virgil as very handſome, and the beauty of his eyes is not forgotten; *Æn.* i. 593.

" Os humeroſque deo ſimilis; namque ipſa decoram
" Cæſariem nato genetrix, lumenque juventæ
" Purpureum, et lætos oculis adflarat honores."

This anſwers exactly to the perſon of Auguſtus:

" Formâ fuit eximiâ, et per omnes ætatis gra-
" dus venuſtiſſimâ. —— vultu tranquillo ſereno-
" que — oculos habuit claros ac nitidos: quibus
" etiam exiſtimari volebat ineſſe quiddam divini
" vigoris: gaudebatque, ſi quis ſibi acrius con-
" tuenti, quaſi ad fulgorem ſolis, vultum ſub-
" mitteret. — capillum leviter inflexum et ſuf-
" flavum." *Suetonius.*

Virgil hath given offence to every modern reader, who is not void of humanity, when he makes his pious Æneas ſeize upon ſeveral young priſoners of war, and ſend them to be murdered at the funeral of Pallas, *Æn.* x. 517. xi. 81. It may be ſaid in excuſe for him, that he follows Homer, who repreſents his brute, Achilles, doing the ſame thing.

thing. But Homer himſelf cenſures it as an inhuman action:

—— κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μήδετο ἔργα.

Iliad. Ψ. 176.

Here then Virgil ſeems to have deſigned to repreſent, and to excuſe, in ſome meaſure, Auguſtus Cæſar, as only following the example of ancient heroes; for in the civil wars he is ſaid to have been guilty of the ſame barbarity.

"—— In ſplendidiſſimum quemque captivum, " non ſine verborum contumelia ſæviit, &c. " Peruſiâ captâ, in plurimos animadvertit: ora- " re veniam, vel excuſare ſe conantibus una vo- " ce occurrens, MORIENDUM eſſe. Scribunt qui- " dam, trecentos ex dedititiis electos, ad aram " divo Julio exſtructam, — hoſtiarum more " mactatos." *Suetonius.*

So *Æn.* x. 599.

" Pluribus oranti Æneas: haud talia dudum " Dicta dabas. MORERE, et fratrem ne deſere frater."

Auguſtus fought his way to empire, and was engaged in a civil war, which terminated in a general peace and tranquillity. Æneas is in much the ſame ſituation, is involved in a kind of civil war, in Italy, and fights againſt a people, with whom he was enter-

ing into alliance, and with whom afterwards he and his Trojans were blended and incorporated, and lived in peace.

Æn. xii. 503.

" —— Tanton' placuit concurrere motu,
" Jupiter, æterna gentes in pace futuras!

Tacitus *Ann.* i. 1, 2.

" Auguſtus — cuncta diſcordiis civilibus feſſa,
" nomine principis ſub imperium accepit. — cun-
" ctos dulcedine otii pellexit."

Suetonius, *Aug.* 22.

" Janum Quirinum — terra marique pace
" parta, ter cluſit."

Virgil ſays of Æneas i. 267.

" Bellum ingens geret Italia, populoſque feroces
" Contundet, moreſque viris et mœnia ponet."

This ſuits exactly with Auguſtus, who valued himſelf particularly upon being the reformer of manners, and the repairer and beautifier of Rome, of which you may ſee proofs collected in Bentley's notes on Horace, *Epiſt.* ii. 1.

" Cum tot ſuſtineas ——
" Res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,
" Legibus emendes.

Ovid. *Met.* xv. 833.

" —— Legeſque feret juſtiſſimus auctor:
" Exemploque ſuo mores reget."

EVERY

EVERY one knoweth that the Æneis was not completed to the author's ſatisfaction, and that he wanted much to deſtroy it. The ſixth book is more finiſhed than ſome of the reſt, and is beautiful in the parts, but upon the whole, it is obſcure, a fault from which Virgil is by no means free; and he who ſhall try the experiment, will find it hard enough to make out of it a ſyſtem tolerably conſiſtent, and to aſcertain the ſenſe of the author in ſome places.

Here then is a field open for criticiſm, and all of us who attempt to explain and illuſtrate Virgil, have reaſon to hope that we may make ſome diſcoveries, and to fear that we may fall into ſome miſtakes; and this ſhould induce us to conjecture with freedom, to propoſe with diffidence, and to diſſent with civility. Ἀγαθὴ δ' ἔρις ἥδε βροτοῖσι, quoth old Heſiod.

VIRGIL is a great borrower, and hath collected from ancient poets and philoſophers whatſoever ſuited his purpoſe. As to his mythology, he had a right to take it from his

his predeceſſors, and is ſufficiently juſtified by their authority in the uſe of poetical fables delivered by tradition, or of new fictions bearing a due reſemblance to the ancient ones. His transforming the ſhips of Æneas into ſea-nymphs hath been thought a fiction too violent and glaringly abſurd; but he had ſufficient vouchers for ſuch a metamorphoſis. The Greek poets had repreſented ſome ſhips as *living creatures.* The ſhip Argo was a[u] great talker, and a propheteſs, *vocalis* and *fatidica*, and at laſt was turned into a conſtellation or a deity. She was made of ſacred trees, and ſo were the ſhips of Æneas. See Apollonius, iv. 580.

Valerius Flaccus, i. 2.

" Fatidicamque ratem, Scythici quæ Phaſidis oras
" Auſa ſequi, medioſque inter juga concita curſus
" Rumpere, flammifero tandem conſedit Olympo.

Manilius v. 13.

" Et ratis heroum, quæ nunc quoque navigat aſtris.

The Phæacians, ſays Alcinous to Ulyſſes, have no pilots, nor have their ſhips any rudders, like other veſſels. Our ſhips are

[u] The pretended Orpheus calls her ἴυλαλον Ἀργώ, *loquacem Argo.* Argonaut. 242. 707. And ſhe makes a long ſpeech, ℣ 1153.

endued

endued with ſenſe, and know their way to every place in the world, and glide ſwift and inviſible through the waters, without fear or danger.

Εἰπὲ δέ μοι γαῖάντε τεὴν, δῆμόν τε, πόλιν τε,
Ὄφρα σε τῇ πέμπωσι τιθυσκόμεναι φρεσὶ νῆες.
Οὐ γὰρ Φαιήκεσσι κυβερνῆται ἔασιν,
Οὐδέ τι πηδάλι' ἐστὶ, τά τ' ἄλλαι νῆες ἔχουσιν·
Ἀλλ' αὐταὶ ἴσασι νοήματα καὶ φρένας ἀνδρῶν·
Καὶ πάντων ἴσασι πόλιας καὶ πίονας ἀγροὺς
Ἀνθρώπων· καὶ λαῖτμα τάχιστ' ἁλὸς ἐκπερόωσιν,
Ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμέναι· οὐδέ ποτε σφιν
Οὔτε τι πημανθῆναι ἔπι δέος, οὐδ' ἀπολέσθαι.

Odyſſ. Θ. 555.

By [w] *the transformation of the ſhips into ſea-deities, Virgil would inſinuate, I ſuppoſe, the great advantages of cultivating a naval power, ſuch as extended commerce, and the dominion of the ocean; which in poetical language is becoming* deities of the ſea, &c.

In favour of this opinion it may be farther obſerved, that Auguſtus owed his empire in a great meaſure to his naval victories.

As to the bleeding myrtles which grew from the body of Polydorus, *Æn.* iii. it ſeems

[w] *Div. Legat.* B. ii. § 4.

to

to be a fable hardly worthy of a place in the Æneis, and Ovid did well not to inſert it in his Metamorphoſes, where he follows Virgil, and relates the adventures of Æneas, l. xiii. The ancient critics blamed it, as we ſee in the note of Servius, *Æn.* iii. 46. and I incline to their opinion, though without cenſuring thoſe friends of Virgil who undertake his defence.

IN Virgil's *Aides* there are rewards for virtue, and puniſhments for vice; a ſtate of purgation for thoſe who are not incorrigible, and moſt of whom are to tranſmigrate into new bodies, an Elyſium for thoſe who are eminently good, a Tartarus for thoſe who are very wicked, and a ſtate, not of purgation, but of introduction, for thoſe who are left for the preſent (the poet hath not told us how long) to the natural reſult of their ſeparation from the body, and with a continuance of the ſame paſſions and affections which they had upon earth. Amongſt theſe latter are the infants, the unjuſtly condemned, the ſelf-murderers, the lovers, and the warriors. None of theſe, I think, are deſcribed

ſcribed as in purgatory, though ſome Commentators have thought ſo. They are deſcribed, for the moſt part, as Homer hath repreſented his ghoſts in Aïdes; and the Greek poet hath not given us even any hint of a purgatory.

Of the lovers, for example, the poet ſaith;

" Hic quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit,
" Secreti celant calles, et myrtea circum
" Silva tegit. Curæ non ipſa in morte relinquunt."

Here is no purification of the mind; nor is melancholy a cure for love, either in the upper or in the lower realms. According to an [x] old Greek poet and philoſopher, the cure for love in this world, is firſt, [z] *faſting*, ſecondly *time*, and thirdly *a halter*: accord-

[x] Crates Thebanus.

[y] Ἔρωϊα παύει λιμός· εἰ δ' μὴ, χρόνος.
Ἐὰν δε τούτοις μὴ δύνῃ χρῆσθαι, βρόχος.
In *Diogenes Laertius*, l. vi. p. 356.

Theſe lines are interpolated in *Stobæus*, and in the *Anthologia*, p. 56. *Edit. Brod.* by ſome unpoetical man, who either thought that the laſt ſyllable of the word θεραπεία was ſhort, or that an iambic verſe would admit a ſpondee in the ſecond foot.

Θεραπεία σοι τὸ λοιπὸν ἡλίθιε βρόχος.

ing to Virgil, in the infernal regions, the purgation of irregular paſſions and bad habits is performed by *air*, by *water*, or by *fire*, 740.

" —— aliæ panduntur inanes
" Suſpenſæ ad ventos: aliis ſub gurgite vaſto
" Infectum eluitur ſcelus, aut exuritur igni."

" Novem circulis (ſays Servius) Inferi cincti eſſe
" dicuntur, quos nunc exſequitur: nam primum
" dicit animas infantum tenere; ſecundum
" eorum qui ſibi per ſimplicitatem adeſſe nequi-
" verunt; tertium eorum qui evitantes ærumnas
" ſe necarunt; quartum eorum qui amaverunt;
" quintum virorum fortium eſſe dicit; ſextum
" nocentes tenent, qui puniuntur a judicibus; in
" ſeptimo animæ purgantur; in octavo ſunt ani-
" mæ ita purgatæ, ut redeant; in nono, ut jam
" non redeant, ſcilicet campus Elyſius," *Ad verſ.* 426.

Thus this ancient and uſeful Commentator.

According to Plato, the greater part of human ſouls deſcend after death, to the Acheruſian lake, where they remain, ſome for a longer and ſome for a leſſer time, and then are ſent into new bodies.—

When the ſhades are carried, each to the place where the Dæmon conducts them, then

then the good and the bad take their trial: and they who have behaved themſelves neither very well, nor very ill, go to Acheron, and there undergo purgations.—

The incurably wicked are caſt into Tartarus, whence they never are to be releaſed. They who have been wicked, but not to ſo great a degree, are alſo caſt into Tartarus, and let out, and caſt in again; and ſo on, till they have made their peace with thoſe whom they had injured.—

The ſouls which have been eminently good, when they are releaſed from this life, aſcend up to the pure regions of the air, and will never more be reunited to a body, but [z] continue in peace and happineſs to all eternity.

This is the doctrine delivered in the *Phædo*.

Virgil's regions of the dead may be thus divided.

There is:

[z] — ἄνευ τε σωμάτων ζῶσι τοπαῤῥάπαν εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον. —

1. A ſtate of excluſion, on the borders of the infernal realms, for the unburied.

2. A ſtate of introduction, where are placed thoſe who had ſhortened their days, or had not lived out their appointed time, according to the common courſe of nature. In this are the apartments of the infants, the unjuſtly condemned, the ſelf-murderers, the lovers, and the warriors.

3. A ſtate of purgatory, which Æneas did not ſee, nor was it proper that he ſhould enter there to diſturb the penitents, whilſt they were undergoing their purifications. Whether this purgatory were in Tartarus or not, the poet hath not told us: but it ſeems to have been diſtinct from it.

4. A ſtate of puniſhment in Tartarus, which alſo Æneas did not ſee.

5. A ſtate of recompenſe and of happineſs in Elyſium.

In *Æn.* v. 731, the infernal regions ſeem to be divided into Tartarus, Elyſium, and a middle ſtate. Anchiſes appears to Æneas by night and ſays;

" Ditis

" Ditis tamen ante
" Infernas accede domos, et Averna per alta
" Congreſſus pete, nate, meos. Non me impia
" namque
" Tartara habent, *triſteſve umbræ*; ſed amœna
" piorum
" Concilia, Elyſiumque colo."

In Maſvicius it is,

" Tartara habent, triſtes umbræ;—

appoſitivè. But I take *triſteſve* to be rather a better reading, *disjunctivè*. See Pierius.

Virgil follows the old poetical fable concerning the reſtleſs ſtate of the unburied; but he cenſures it as an unjuſt decree of providence. *Æn.* vi. 325, &c.

" Conſtitit Anchiſa ſatus, et veſtigia preſſit;
" Multa putans, ſortemque animo miſeratus
" *iniquam*."

The ſame ſort of ſuperſtition crept into the Chriſtian world concerning the ſtate of unbaptized infants.

The note of Servius upon this paſſage is ingenious:

" *Sortem iniquam*. Iniqua enim ſors eſt, puniri
" propter alterius negligentiam: nec enim quis

" culpâ ſuâ caret ſepulcro. Bene autem *animo*,
" quaſi re præſaga, ut alibi: *Præſaga mali mens.*
" Ipſe enim Æneas inſepultus jacebit, ut: *Me-*
" *diaque inhumatus arena:* periit enim in flumine
" Numico: unde et Juvenalis:

" *et ipſe tamen contingens ſanguine cælum,*
" *Alter aquis, alter flammis ad ſidera miſſus.*"

Lucan philoſophizes better upon this ſubject, vii. 809.

" Tabeſne cadavera ſolvat,
" An rogus, haud refert: placido Natura receptat
" Cuncta ſinu, finemque ſui ſibi corpora debent.—
" Libera fortunæ mors eſt: capit omnia tellus,
" Quæ genuit: cælo tegitur, qui non habet
" urnam."

And conformably to this opinion Virgil ſays *Æn.* ii. 646.

" Facilis jactura ſepulcri."

Virgil places Theſeus in Tartarus, and ſays of him,

" ſedet, æternumque ſedebit."

This alone will not perhaps fully prove the *eternity* of puniſhments, for both the word *æternus* itſelf is ſometimes of a lax ſignification, as every learned man knows, and,

and, *ſedet, æternumque ſedebit*, may mean; there he ſits, and there he will always ſit—namely, as long as he remains in Tartarus.

But if to this paſſage you add the Platonic doctrine, that very wicked ſpirits were never releaſed from Tartarus, and the ſilence of Virgil as to any diſmiſſion from that jail, and the cenſure of the Epicureans, who objected to religious ſyſtems the eternity of puniſhments,

"Æternas quoniam pœnas in morte timendum;"

and the general doctrine of the Mythologiſts, and the opinion of Servius that Virgil was to be taken in this ſenſe, we may conclude that the puniſhments in his Tartarus were probably eternal.

But then it muſt be ſuppoſed, on the other hand, that the rewards in his Elyſium were eternal. A religious ſyſtem, conſiſting of puniſhments which are *eternal*, and of rewards which are only *temporary*, appears ſo very unreaſonable, that one would not be eaſily perſuaded to think that Virgil could adopt it, even by way of poetic fiction; for

it is a more ſhocking monſter than any that he hath ſtationed at the gates of hell.

There is indeed one paſſage in Virgil which ſeems to favour this notion, but which may eaſily be rectified.

We may ſuppoſe that Elyſium was the receptacle of two ſort of ſhades, of tranſmigrating and of untranſmigrating ſouls.

The ſhades of accompliſhed, and excellent men, after a ſhort purgation, were ſent to Elyſium, there to dwell at large, and to dwell for ever. They were few, for ſo large a territory, and few compared with the ſouls which were doomed to tranſmigration, 743.

" Quisque ſuos patimur manes: exinde per am-
" plum
" Mittimur Elyſium, et pauci læta arva tene-
" mus."

And 673.

" Nulli certa domus. Lucis habitamus opacis," &c.

Anchiſes ſays, — *læta arva tenemus.* The verb *tenere*, may mean to have the ſure and certain

certain poſſeſſion of any thing, and may be elegantly here uſed, in oppoſition to being inmates only for a time.

But the ſhades of thoſe who had been leſs perfect, and had not behaved ſo well in this world, had not the ſame privilege. After their longer purgations, they had their ſtation in a certain part, or in the ſuburbs of Elyſium, and they were very numerous, 680.

" At pater Anchiſes penitus convalle virenti
" Incluſas animas, ſuperumque ad lumen ituras
" Luſtrabat."

And 703.

" Interea videt Æneas in valle reducta
" Secluſum nemus,—
" Hunc circum innumeræ gentes, populique vo-
" labant," &c.

And theſe were,

" Animæ quibus altera fato
" Corpora debentur."

713.

Here Servius notes:

" Sciendum, non omnes animas ad corpora re-
" verti. Aliquæ enim propter vitæ merita non re-
" deunt; aliquæ *redeunt* propter malam vitam;
" *aliquæ* propter fati neceſſitatem."

This is abſurd, and contrary to Virgil's ſyſtem, and to other interpretations which Servius himſelf hath given. But it only wants emendation. The verb *redeunt* is miſplaced, and the laſt *aliquæ* ſhould be *reliquæ*, and then we have good ſenſe, and a reaſonable remark. You are to obſerve, ſays Servius, that all the ſhades do not return, to dwell again in human bodies: *Aliquæ enim propter vitæ merita non redeunt*; *aliquæ propter malam vitam*; reliquæ redeunt *propter fati neceſſitatem.* For ſome do not return, becauſe they are too good, and are ſettled in Elyſium; others, becauſe they are too bad, and are caſt into Tartarus; and the reſt return, becauſe the laws of fate have ſo appointed it.

The ſoul of every living creature, ſays Anchiſes, proceeds from the Soul of the world, which is diffuſed through the whole. So it is naturally divine and pure, but it contracts ſome pollution from its union with the body, and wants a purgation.

As to the deſtination of the ſouls of brutes, the poet declines that point, judging it to be foreign

foreign from his purpoſe. In *Georg.* iv. 219. he mentions it, as the opinion of ſome of the learned, that every ſoul of man or brute, is derived from the Deity, the univerſal Soul, and upon death, immediately returns to it again:

" His quidam ſignis, atque hæc exampla ſecuti,
" Eſſe apibus partem divinæ mentis, et hauſtus
" Ætherios dixere: Deum namque ire per omnes
" Terraſque, tractuſque maris, cælumque pro-
" fundum.
" Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne
" ferarum,
" Quemque ſibi tenues naſcentem arceſſere vitas.
" Scilicet huc reddi deinde, ac reſoluta referri
" Omnia, nec morti eſſe locum; ſed viva volare
" Sideris in numerum, atque alto ſuccedere cælo."

Human ſouls then muſt be purified, v. 739.

" Ergo exercentur pœnis. —
" aliæ panduntur inanes
" Suſpenſæ ad ventos: aliis ſub gurgite vaſto
" Infectum eluitur ſcelus, aut exuritur igni.
" Quiſque ſuos patimur manes: exinde per am-
" plum
" Mittimur Elyſium, et pauci læta arva tenemus:
" Donec

" Donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,
" Concretam exemit labem, purumque reliquit
" Ætherium ſenſum, atque auraï ſimplicis ignem.
" *Has omnes*, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos,
" Lethæum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine
" magno:
" Scilicet immemores ſupera ut convexa reviſant,
" Rurſus et incipiant in corpora velle reverti."

Has omnes, &c. That is, (ſays Servius on 745, and 748.) all the purified ſouls, without exception, and all the inhabitants of Elyſium, muſt return at laſt, though late, to human bodies. But either Servius contradicts himſelf, or this is not Servius; it is ſome other Commentator, whoſe notes are mixed with thoſe of Servius.

Now there is no neceſſity at all to ſuppoſe that *Has omnes* refers to the *pauci læta arva tenemus*, nor indeed doth the conſtruction proceed regularly in that manner. A parentheſis will remove the perplexity, and ſolve the difficulty.

" Ergo exercentur pœnis—
" Aliæ panduntur inanes—
" Infectum eluitur ſcelus, aut exuritur igni:
" (Quiſque ſuos patimur Manes: exinde per
" amplum
" Mittimur

" Mittimur Elyſium, et pauci læta arva tenemus.)
" Donec longa dies ——
" Has omnes, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos--

And then *has omnes* hath nothing to do with the more excellent ſouls in Elyſium, but refers to the more vulgar ſouls which underwent a long purgation, and to the *Animæ quibus altera fato corpora debentur*, of which he had ſpoken before.

The parentheſis propoſed is neceſſary, becauſe the words *Donec longa dies* are plainly connected with, *Ergo exercentur pœnis*, &c. and not at all with *pauci læta arva tenemus*.

The word *donec* hath only two ſenſes. Firſt, it means, *quamdiu, as long as:* Secondly, *quouſque, quoad, uſque dum, until.* Virgil conſtantly, and in ſeventeen other places, uſes *donec* in the ſecond ſenſe, for *until*; and Ruæus is much miſtaken when he takes *donec*, in this paſſage, to mean *quando* or *poſtquam*.

Charon is deſcribed as carrying over the *Shades* of thoſe who were buried; and yet Virgil ſays of him, 303.

" Et ferruginea ſubvectat *corpora* cymba:

alluding,

alluding, as it ſhould ſeem, to the Ægyptian Charon, whoſe office it was to ferry over the dead bodies.

Æneas pacifies Charon, by ſhewing him the golden bough, *Æn.* vi. 408.

Great is the power of gold;

" Aurum per medios ire ſatellites,
" Et perrumpere amat ſaxa, potentius
" Ictu fulmineo.

So Horace perhaps would have interpreted the fable.

" ille admirans venerabile donum
" Fatalis virgæ, longo poſt tempore viſum,
" Cœruleam advertit puppim.

If forty or fifty years had paſſed ſince Charon's eyes had been bleſſed with the ſight, that would have ſufficiently juſtified the expreſſion, *longo poſt tempore.* But it cannot be collected from poetical records that he had ſeen it ſo lately; for Hercules, Theſeus, and Pirithous, who took the ſame journey to Aïdes before Æneas, carried no bough for a *paſſe-par-tout*, and did not enter in peaceably, but by violence; and as to Orpheus

Orpheus, his perſuaſive voice and enchanting lyre opened the paſſage for him.

Virgil hath placed in the infernal regions the ſouls of infants [a] weeping and wailing, 426.

" Continuo auditæ voces, vagitus et ingens,
" Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo:
" Quos dulcis vitæ exſortis, et ab ubere raptos,
" Abſtulit atra dies, et funere merſit acerbo.

It is an ingenious conjecture propoſed in the *Divine Legat.* that the poet might deſign to diſcountenance the curſed practice of expoſing and murdering infants. It might be added, that Virgil had perhaps alſo in view to pleaſe Auguſtus, who was deſirous of encouraging matrimony and the education of children, and extremely intent upon repeopling Italy, which had been exhauſted by the civil wars.

" Audiet pugnas vitio parentum
" Rara juventus.

But if theſe infants were to be left in this lamentable ſtate for all eternity, the poet's

[a] The author of the *Life of Sethos*, in his learned Romance, ſuppoſes theſe infants to be the children of Ægyptian prieſts, who were educated in ſubterraneous manſions; and the purgation by fire, air, and water to be the trials which the initiated paſſed through.

ſyſtem

ſyſtem would be horribly ſhocking, and only fit for a ſupralapſarian profeſſor. How long then were they to weep and wail? Perhaps, as long as they ought to have lived upon earth, according to the common courſe of nature. After this period we may ſuppoſe that they took a ſmall ſip of the Lethean water, and were ſent into new bodies.

Plutarch mentions it as an ancient opinion of the Greeks, that the ſouls of infants entered immediately into a happier and a more divine ſtate.

Τοῖς γὰρ αὐτῶν νηπίοις ἀποθανοῦσιν ὅτε χοὰς ὑπιφέρουσιν, ὅτ' ἄλλα δρῶσι περὶ αὐλὰ οἷα εἰκὸς ὑπὲρ θανόντων ποιεῖν τὰς ἄλλας. ὐ γὰρ μέτεσι γῆς ὐδὲν ὅτε τῶν περὶ γῆν αὐτοῖς. ὐδ' [b] αὐτᾶ περὶ ταφὰς ἢ μνήμαλα, ἢ προθέσεις νεκρῶν φιλοχωροῦσι ἢ παρακάθηνται τοῖς σώμασιν, ὐ γὰρ ἐῶσιν οἱ νόμοι τὰς τηλικάτας, ὡς ὐχ ὅσιον εἰς βελτίονα ἢ θειοτέραν μοῖραν ἅμα ἢ χώραν μεθεσηκότας.

"Suis enim infantibus mortuis neque inferias "libant, neque aliud quicquam faciunt eorum "quæ fieri mortuis apud alios ſolent. Neque "enim terræ aut terreſtrium infantes ullam par-"tem percipiunt, neque circum eorum ſepulcra

[b] F. αὐτῶν.

"et

" et monumenta ac cadaverum expoſitionem
" commorantur aut adſident. Nam leges id non
" permittunt: quia hoc nefas ſit, cum ii in me-
" liorem ac diviniorem conditionem ſimul locum-
" que conceſſerint." *Conſol. ad Uxorem*, p. 612.

Next appear they who had ſuffered death by an unjuſt ſentence, 430.

" Hos juxta falſo damnati crimine mortis."

Damnati mortis, ſubaudi, *ſupplicio:* condemned to die: *falſo crimine*, for a crime falſely laid to their charge. It is an ellipſis, like that in Horace;

" damnatuſque longi
" Siſyphus Æolides laboris.

Perſons falſely accuſed, and unjuſtly ſentenced to die, have frequently been public-ſpirited men, patriots, philoſophers, and lovers of their country, who were oppreſſed by vile factions and inſolent tyrants. It ſeems hard that ſuch perſons ſhould not be more decently provided for in Virgil's Aïdes. A conjecture occurred to me, which as it lies within the bounds of probability, ſhall not be ſuppreſſed, but ſhall take its chance amongſt thoſe of other interpreters.

Theſe perſons, then, like the infants, the warriors, &c. had not [c] lived out the time intended for them, and therefore were left for the preſent in the ſtate preceding that of purification and of recompenſe.

But beſides this; it is a notion, as old as mankind, and ſpread through all nations, that the ghoſts of perſons unjuſtly condemned, or baſely murdered, were permitted to purſue their enemies, and to haunt and torment them, and were not at reſt till vengeance was ſatisfied. You find ſomething of this in *Geneſis* iv. 10.

" The voice of thy brother's blood crieth
" unto me from the ground."

You find it in *Revelat.* vi. 9.

" I ſaw under the altar the ſouls of them
" that were ſlain for the word of God, and
" for the teſtimony which they held. And
" they cried with a loud voice, ſaying, How
" long, o Lord, holy and true, doſt thou
" not judge and avenge our blood on them
" that dwell on the earth?"

[c] See Mr. Addiſon's remarks on this ſubject, in the *Tatler.* N°. 152, and 154.

So Dido, conſidering Æneas as her murderer, threatens to haunt him, iv. 384.

" ſequar atris ignibus abſens :
" Et cum frigida mors anima ſeduxerit artus,
" Omnibus umbra locis adero. Dabis, improbe,
" pœnas."

In Horace, *Carm.* v. 5. the boy ſays to the witches, who intended to murder him ;

" Diris agam vos : dira deteſtatio
" Nulla expiatur victima.
" Quin ubi perire juſſus expiravero,
" Nocturnus occurram Furor;
" Petamque vultus umbra curvis unguibus,
" Quæ vis Deorum eſt Manium,
" Et inquietis aſſidens præcordiis
" Pavore ſomnos auferam."

Upon this ſuppoſition, when revenge had been executed on the guilty, then theſe much injured ſhades were diſpoſed of according to their deſerts.

The ſuppoſition that the ſouls in Aïdes had liberty thus to return, and to paſs and repaſs, or to ſend dreams in their own image and likeneſs, is poetical and Virgilian :

" Nocte vagæ ferimur. Nox clauſas liberat umbras,
" Errat et abjecta Cerberus ipſe ſera.
" Luce jubent leges Lethæa ad ſtagna reverti.

Propertius, iv. 7. p. 449. where ſee Broukhuſius, as alſo on i. xix. 10.

Tibullus ii. 7.

" Ne tibi neglecti mittant nova ſomnia manes,
" Mœſtaque ſopitæ ſtet ſoror ante torum.

Æn. iv. 351.

" Me patris Anchiſæ,—quoties aſtra ignea ſurgunt,
" Admonet in ſomnis, et turbida terret imago.

Æn. vi. 695.

" Tua me, genitor, tua triſtis imago,
" Sæpius occurrens, hæc limina tendere adegit.

Æn. v. 99.

" animamque vocabat
" Anchiſæ magni, maneſque Acheronte remiſſos.

Where Servius;

" Aut venientes de Acheronte ad hanc paren-
" tationem; aut certe remiſſos Acheronte, qui
" jam in Acheronte non eſſent, poſt apotheoſin
" factam."

The firſt of theſe interpretations is the more natural and probable.

As upon the tranſmigrating ſyſtem, there was a conſtant demand for ſeparate ſouls to return into human bodies, it may be ſuppoſed that the lovers, the ſuicides, the warriors,

riors, &c. were to remain in the ſituation wherein the poet hath placed them, till their turn ſhould come to enter, firſt into a ſtate of purgation, and then into a ſtate of tranſmigration: 760,

" Ille, vides, pura juvenis qui nititur haſta,
" Proxima *ſorte* tenet lucis loca; primus ad auras
" Ætherias Italo commixtus ſanguine ſurget.

After the line;

" Hos juxta falſo damnati crimine mortis:

Virgil adds 431.

" Nec vero *hæ* ſine ſorte datæ, ſine judice ſedes.

But *hæ ſedes* can be referred to nothing that the poet hath mentioned; and I think this conjecture of a learned friend to be plauſible:

" Nec vero *his* ſine ſorte datæ, ſine judice ſedes."

There is nothing in the note of Servius that forbids this emendation. Suppoſe that the firſt copy had HISSINE, and that afterward one s was dropped, it would then be HI SINE, which might be changed into HÆ, to make it agree with *ſedes*.

Æneas when he was conducted through the infernal regions, beheld the outſide of Tartarus, and heard the noiſe within, and

ſaw the formidable guards who kept watch at the gate, but was not permitted to enter in. He received an account of thoſe dreadful manſions from the mouth of the Sibyl, who had been there, 559.

" Conſtitit Æneas, ſtrepitumque exterritus hauſit.--
" Tunc vates ſic orſa loqui: dux inclute Teucrum,
" Nulli fas caſto ſceleratum inſiſtere limen:
" Sed me cum lucis Hecate præfecit avernis,
" Ipſa Deum pœnas docuit, perque omnia duxit." etc.

Here Virgil differs from Homer; for in Homer, Ulyſſes ſees Tityus, Siſyphus, and Tantalus ſuffering puniſhments; but in Virgil, Æneas is only informed by the Sibyl how they are puniſhed.

Amongſt thoſe who ſuffer in Tartarus, Virgil mentions Theſeus and Phlegyas. The place is remarkable on ſeveral accounts. 617.

" Sedet, æternumque ſedebit
" Infelix Theſeus: Phlegyaſque miſerrimus omnes
" Admonet, et magna teſtatur voce per umbras;
" Diſcite juſtitiam, moniti, et non temnere divos.

Here Servius notes; *Si Phlegyas eſt* nominativus ſingularis, *hoc dicit:* Phlegyas omnes admonet apud inferos pœnas ferentes. *Si autem Phlegyas* accuſativus pluralis *eſt*,

Theſeum omnes Phlegyas admonentem *debemus accipere*. Ainſworth, in his dictionary, ſpeaking of Phlegyas, and ſending his reader to Virgil, as Faber hath done, adds; *Cujus tamen loci ambiguus eſt ſenſus, poteſt enim eſſe accuſativus pluralis vocis* Phlegyæ. And ſome of Virgil's interpreters have voted for the *accuſative caſe*. But the other conſtruction is the more natural and probable. Theſeus and Phlegyas ſeem to be the two perſons here deſcribed, and each hath his proper epithet; Theſeus is called *infelix*, and Phlegyas, *miſerrimus*.

Statius and Valerius Flaccus underſtood Virgil as I do.

Statius, *Theb.* i. 712.

" Ultrix tibi torva Megæra
" Jejunum Phlegyam ſubter cava ſaxa jacentem
" Æterno premit accubitu, dapibuſque profanis
" Inſtimulat: ſed miſta famem faſtidia vincunt.

Valerius Flaccus, ii. 192.

" Inferni qualis ſub nocte barathri
" Adcubat attonitum Phlegyan et Theſea juxta
" Tiſiphone, ſævaſque dapes, et pocula libat,
" Tormenti genus, et nigris amplectitur hydris.

Homer places Theſeus, and Pirithous alſo, amongſt the deceaſed heroes in Aïdes, but not

amongſt thoſe who were tormented in thoſe regions. In *Odyſſ.* Λ. 629, Ulyſſes wanted much to have a ſight of them, but dared not to ſtay any longer:

Καί νύ κ' ἔτι προϊέρυς ἴδον ἀνέρας, ὃς ἔθελόν περ,
Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε, θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα.

Let us not conceal the remark of Hereas of Megara, who ſuſpected that Piſiſtratus foiſted this line into Homer, to pleaſe the Athenians. Plutarch in *Theſeus*, p. 8, 9. Others may as juſtly ſuppoſe that the ſuſpicion of Hereas was groundleſs.

Virgil, however, thought fit to put Theſeus into Tartarus without proper vouchers, and *contra opinionem*, ſays Servius, ℣ 617, and he places him there, not for *injuſtice* to men, but for *impiety*, and only one act of impiety, for an attempt to carry off Proſerpine; as Charon ſays, ℣ 392.

"Nec vero Alciden me ſum lætatus euntem
"Accepiſſe lacu, nec Theſea Pirithoumque:
"Diis quanquam geniti, atque invicti viribus eſſent.
"Tartareum ille manu cuſtodem in vincla petivit;
"Ipſius e ſolio regis traxitque trementem:
"Hi dominam Ditis thalamo deducere adorti."

Virgil being ſenſible that the puniſhment of Theſeus was too ſevere, as he was an illuſtrious warrior, who did great ſervices to the public, and cleared the world of many a villain and many a monſter, and had a better character than moſt of the ancient heroes, and had divine honours and worſhip paid to him by the Athenians, and who was betrayed into the raſh attempt upon Proſerpine by too much affection [g] for his beloved

[g] After having tried in vain to diſſuade him: ἐπειδὴ συμβελεύων οὐχ οἷός τ' ἦν ἀποτρέπειν. Iſocrates, *Helen. Encom.* who takes all opportunities to extol Theſeus as an accompliſhed hero.

Τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ Θησεὺς μετέπεισεν αὐτὸν, ἀποτρέπων τῆς πράξεως, διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν. Τοῦ δὲ Πειρίθου βιαζομένου, συναναγκάσθη διὰ τοὺς ὅρκους ὁ Θησεὺς μετασχεῖν τῆς πράξεως. καὶ πέραις καταβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς καθ' ᾅδου τόπους, συνέβη διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἀμφοτέρους δεθῆναι, καὶ Θησέα μὲν ὕστερον διὰ τὴν Ἡρακλέους χάριν ἀπολυθῆναι, Πειρίθουν δὲ διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐν ᾅδου διατελεῖν τιμωρίας αἰωνίου τυγχάνοντα. ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν μυθογράφων φασὶ μὴ τυχεῖν ἀμφοτέρους τοῦ νόσου.

Id diſſuadere initio Theſeus, hominemque ab incepto, quod impium eſſet, retrahere. Sed inſtante Pirithoo vehementius, ille juramenti religione coactus, in ſocietatem hanc conſenſit. Plutonis ergo regiam ingreſſi, ob impietatem ambo in vincula conjiciuntur, ſed Theſeus poſtea, in gratiam Herculis exſolutus abiit. Piri-

friend Pirithous, beſtows upon him the compaſſionate epithet *infelix*, as juſtly belonging to one who deſerved a better fate and gentler uſage. The puniſhment allotted to Theſeus was a ſtate of inactivity; he was to ſit ſtill, which muſt have been irkſome enough to a ſpritely hero; but it was far from being as bad as the condition of Tityus, Ixion, Siſyphus, and the reſt of the criminals in Tartarus; and therefore Virgil could not with any propriety call him *miſerrimus*, as he muſt do in the ſenſe and conſtruction which we have rejected.

As to Phlegyas, he, as Servius informs us, *habuit Coronidem filiam, quam Apollo vitiavit. Quod pater dolens, incendit Apollinis templum, et ejus ſagittis eſt ad inferos truſus.*

We know very little of the hiſtory of Phlegyas, and Virgil might follow ancient

thous vero apud inferos detentus, ſempiternas impietatis pœnas luit. Quamvis neutrum inde reverſum quidam ſcriptores fabularum dicant. *Diodorus Siculus*, l. iv. p. 265.

But he had ſaid before that Hercules, Θησέα μὲν ἀνήγαγεν ἐκ δεσμῶν μετὰ Πειρίθου. Theſeum e vinculis exemit cum Pirithoo, p. 232.

accounts,

accounts, now loſt, which repreſented him guilty of *injuſtices* and *violences*, as well as of *impiety*. So the poet, in his account of Eriphyle, ſeems to allude to ſome ſtory now ſunk in oblivion. He places her amongſt the love ſick ladies, and ſhe had been in love indeed, but it was with a diamond necklace, for the ſake of which ſhe ſold and betrayed her huſband. Therefore Ruæus ſuppoſes that her love was of another ſort; *Cum autem inter amantes a Virgilio ſtatuatur, neceſſe eſt eam non ſolo monilis dono, ſed ſtupro fuiſſe corruptam.* But what ſhall we ſay of Virgil's introducing *Cænis* amongſt the diſconſolate lovers, for no reaſon that his Commentators can diſcern?

Without having recourſe to this ſolution, in the caſe of Phlegyas, his burning a temple may paſs in ſome ſenſe for an act of injuſtice, ſince the prieſts and the ſervants of the temple muſt have been driven out of doors, and the inhabitants of the country put to the expence of building another.

Phlegyas is ſaid to have been the ſon of Mars, the king of the Lapithæ, and the father of Ixion. It may be ſuppoſed that he

he was one of thoſe who feared neither gods nor men, and that his ſon Ixion was κακὸς κόραξ κακὸν ᾠόν. It hath been thought alſo that the Phlegyæ, a very wicked people, had their denomination from him.

According to the account of Servius, Phlegyas ſeems to have had hard meaſure, and Apollo deſerved to have his temple fired for raviſhing the man's daughter. But upon the Pagan ſyſtem, men were obliged to bear all ſorts of inſults and injuries from their miſchievous gods, without pretending to take revenge. The poet, however, hath not ſpecified either the crimes or the torments of Phlegyas, but repreſents him in general as unjuſt and impious and very miſerable; and we muſt take his word for it.

The poetical Gods are moſt inſolent and unreaſonable tyrants. Homer's *Neptune* purſues Ulyſſes with implacable malice, only becauſe the hero would not ſuffer himſelf to be devoured by [f] Polyphemus, and had put

[f] Euripides hath made this adventure of Ulyſſes the ſubject of a Play called *Cyclops*, which indeed is offenſive, as it is obſcene, but hath perhaps more of *wit*, and of

out

out the eye of the monſter, who had the honour to be Neptune's child; and *Sol* takes unmerciful vengeance of the companions of Ulyſſes, becauſe they had made bold to eat ſome of his cattle, when they were wind-bound and half-ſtarved. The reader, I hope, will give me leave to ſtep aſide, and correct a paſſage in Libanius relating to this ſtory.

IT never was publicly known by whom the Emperor Julian was killed. Poſſibly it was a Chriſtian, ſays Sozomen, who was animated by conſidering how the deſtroyers of tyrants had been celebrated in ancient times. Scarcely can any one blame him, if for the ſake of God and of religion he performed ſo heroic an action, vii. 2. An odd ſort of doctrine this, that a Chriſtian ſubject and a ſoldier might aſſaſſinate his Emperor and his General!

Libanius complains bitterly that no ſearch was made into it, and exhorts the Emperor

what the Engliſh call *humour*, than any play of Ariſtophanes.

Theodoſius

Theodoſius to revenge Julian's death. He plainly intimates that a Chriſtian did the deed, inſtigated by ſome of his brethren; and it may be conjectured from his way of ſpeaking concerning it, that if the Emperor would have encouraged an inquiry, there were Pagans who would have charged it upon the Chriſtians; whether truly or falſely, it is impoſſible to ſay: but no notice was taken of it, and ſo it never came to light. See Libanius *Orat. de ulciſcenda Juliani nece*, and his *Parental. in Julianum*, in Fabricius *Bibl. Gr.* vii. 145. 363.

Libanius muſt have poſſeſſed a conſummate impudence, who could addreſs to a Chriſtian Emperor a mere panegyric on Paganiſm, and a lampoon on Chriſtianity; for ſuch is his oration.

There is a paſſage in it, which, as it ſtands, is very ſenſeleſs and ſtupid, and yet may be eaſily mended. It is a wonder that the tranſlator Olearius, and the editor Fabricius, did not perceive and correct it. Why ſhould not the immortal gods, ſays Libanius, be grievouſly offended at us, and puniſh us for the

the death of Julian, when Apollo could be ſo angry about the daughter of Chryſes, &c.-- ὅτω μὲν χαλεπήναντος τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀποδοῦναι τῷ Χρύσῃ τὴν θυγάτερα τὸν δεῖνα, ὅτω δὲ ΒΟΩΝΤΟΣ τινων εἵνεκα τοῦ Ἡλίου, ὥστε τοιαῦτα ἀπειλῆσαι τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς, εἰ μὴ λάβοι δίκην.—

Cum tamen Græcis adeo iraſceretur Apollo, quod Chryſæ filiam non redderet Agamemnon, cumve adeo propter (paucos) quoſdam VOCIFERATVS SIT *Phœbus, ut tanta reliquis Diis quoque fuerit minatus, niſi vindictâ placetur*, &c.

The companions of Ulyſſes ate the *oxen* of the *Sun*, upon which the God made his complaint to Jupiter;

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἠδ' ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔοντες,
Τίσαι δὴ ἑτάρους Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος,
Οἱ μεῦ βοῦς ἔκτειναν—
Εἰ δέ μοι οὐ τίσουσι βοῶν ἐπεεικέ' ἀμοιβὴν,
Δύσομαι εἰς Ἀΐδαο, καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω.

" Jupiter pater, aliique Dii immortales,
" Fac luere ſocios Läertiadæ Ulyſſis,
" Qui meas boves occiderunt—
" Quod ſi mihi non luant boum talionem,
" Deſcendam in Orcum, et inter mortuos lucebo."

Homer *Odyſſ.* M. 377.

Here

Here is the anger, and here are the menaces. Correct therefore in Libanius, *meo periculo*, as the Critics ſay, — ἕτω ἢ ΒΟΩΝ τινων εἵνεκα τῦ Ἡλίȣ —

" Why ſhould not the gods hate us and " puniſh us for the murder of Julian, when " *Apollo* could be ſo angry, becauſe Aga- " memnon would not reſtore to Chryſes his " daughter, and when *Sol* was ſo incenſed, " upon account of *a few paltry oxen*, as to " threaten the reſt of the gods, that if he " had not proper ſatisfaction, he would de- " ſcend into Hades and ſhine amongſt the " dead?"

Some tranſcriber took βοῶν to be the participle of βοάω, and then turned it into βοῶντ☉, to make it agree with it Ἡλίȣ.

Such is the childiſh and ridiculous argument of Libanius, to exhort the Emperor and the Romans not to ſuffer the murder of Julian to go unrevenged!

Olearius tranſlates Ἥλι☉, *Phœbus*. It ſhould have been *Sol:* for *Phœbus* or *Apollo*, and *Sol*, ſeem to be two diſtinct gods in Homer

mer and Heſiod, though afterwards they were confounded; and Libanius in this very paſſage diſtinguiſhes them, and ſo doth Lucian in *Bis Accuſ.* in the beginning of that dialogue. The Aſſyrians alſo accounted them two gods, as you may ſee in Lucian *De Dea Syria*, 34, 35. and they could not think them to be one and the ſame, who called the planet Mercury, *Apollo*. Pliny N. H. ii. 6. p. 76.

I NOW return to Virgil, and to Phlegyas. The ſpeech of Phlegyas,

" Diſcite juſtitiam, moniti, et non temnere di-
" vos,"

is thus ridiculed, it ſeems, by the French poet *Scarron*:

" Cette ſentence eſt bonne & belle:
" Mais en Enfer de quoi ſert-elle?"

Th' adviſe is wiſe; but can you tell
What ſervice it will do in Hell?

Virgil here follows Pindar, as Urſinus and others have obſerved, and imitates the bold poet,

poet, who makes Ixion upon his wheel a preacher of juſtice and gratitude.

Θεῶν δ' ἐφ[ε]μαῖς
Ἰξίονα φαν[ὶ] τᾶυ[τ]α
Βρο[τ]οῖς λέγειν ἐν π[τ]ερόεν[τ]ι τροχῷ
Παν[τ]ὰ κυλινδόμενον,
Τὸν Εὐεργέταν ἀγαναῖς ἀμοιβαῖς.
Ἐποιχομένυς τίνεσθαι. *Pyth.* ii. 39.

" Deorum autem mandatis, Ixionem aiunt hæc " mortalibus dicere in celeri rota perpetuo volu- " tatum, ut benefactorem benevolis compenſa- " tionibus excipientes remunerent."

Scarron's remark may perhaps paſs off well enough for a piece of buffoonry; but if intended for a ſerious argument, is inconcluſive, as others have obſerved. I account it to be ſo, for the following reaſons:

1. It is the objection of a man who applies his own Chriſtian notions of Hell to the poetical Hell, which is ridiculous enough.

2. To preach to the damned, ſays he, is labour in vain. And what if it is? It might be part of his puniſhment to exhort himſelf and others, when exhortations were too late.

The

The admonition, ſo far as it relates to himſelf and to his companions in miſery, is to be looked upon not ſo much as an admonition to amend, but as a bitter ſarcaſm, and reproaching of paſt iniquities.

It is labour in vain. But in the poetical ſyſtem, it ſeems to have been the occupation of the damned to labour in vain, to catch at meat and drink that fled from them, to fill a leaky veſſel with water, to roll a ſtone up-hill that fell down again, &c.

3. According to Plato, there were ſhades in Tartarus which were capable of amendment; and to ſuch Phlegyas might prove an uſeful monitor, if you will admit ſuch into Virgil's Tartarus.

4. Phlegyas proclaims his doctrine with a very loud voice,

"magna teſtatur voce per umbras."

He might then be heard in the infernal regions by ſome ſhades which were intended for tranſmigration; and Virgil ſeems to have had ſome ſuch thing in view, by taking notice of his moſt audible voice.

5. His inſtruction, like that of Ixion in Pindar, might be for the uſe of the living. You will ſay, *How can that be?* Surely nothing is more eaſy and intelligible. The Muſes hear him ;

Ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐσε, πάρεσέ τε, ἴσε τε πάνλα.

The Muſes reveal it to the poet, and the inſpired poet reveals it to mankind. And ſo much for Phlegyas, and Monſieur Scarron.

Virgil hath placed in his Elyſium inhabitants worthy of the abodes, 660.

" Hic manus ob patriam pugnando vulnera paſſi, &c.

and amongſt other excellent perſons are,

" Quique ſui memores alios fecere merendo."

And theſe are ſurely the moſt amiable and reſpectable part of mankind.

Yet in theſe happy regions the poet ſeemeth not to have introduced one female, though the Roman and Grecian hiſtory might have furniſhed him with ſeveral who deſerved admittance as much as the beſt of

his heroes. But it is an obſervation of Dryden, I think, that he hath been uncomplaiſant to the fair ſex.

The Arabian impoſtor had very different notions about Elyſium, or Paradiſe; and ſo had Tibullus, i. 3.

" Hic choreæ cantuſque vigent, paſſimque va-
" gantes
" Dulce ſonant tenui gutture carmen aves.—
" Hic juvenum ſeries teneris immixta puellis
" Ludit, et aſſidue prelia miſcet Amor."

And Propertius, iv. 7.

" Ecce coronato pars altera vecta phaſelo,
" Mulcet ubi Elyſias aura beata roſas:
" Qua numeroſa fides, quaque æra rotunda Cy-
" bebes,
" Mitratiſque ſonant Lydia plectra choris:
" Andromedeque et Hypermneſtre, ſine fraude
" maritæ,
" Narrant hiſtoriæ pectora nota ſuæ."

According to Ovid, the dead parrot of Corinna was there, amongſt other birds of good reputation:

" Pſittacus has inter, nemorali ſede receptus,
" Convertit volucres in ſua verba pias."

Amor. ii. 6.

Virgil hath alſo introduced muſic, vocal and inſtrumental, into Elyſium, having placed Orpheus in thoſe happy regions, as Horace hath admitted Sappho and Alcæus, 645.

" Nec non Threicius longa cum veſte ſacerdos
" Obloquitur numeris ſeptem diſcrimina vocum,
" Jamque eadem digitis, jam pectine pulſat
" eburno."

In theſe lines, which I do not remember to have ſeen well explained, *ſeptem diſcrimina vocum* are the ſeven notes of muſic, or muſical ſounds in general. *Numeri* are *airs*, or tunes, as in *Ecl.* ix. 45.

" numeros memini, ſi verba tenerem."

I remember the tune, if I could recollect the words.

Obloqui is to ſing the ſame notes that the ſtrings ſound.

Orpheus therefore accompanies his lyre with his voice, in his melodious airs; ſinging, and ſtriking the chords, now with his fingers, now with the *plectrum*, or *pecten*, or *bow*, or *quill*, or what you pleaſe to call it.

The

The ſacrifice which Æneas offers to the infernal Deities of a black ſheep, and a virgin cow, and his drawing his ſword to keep off the ghoſts, *Æn.* vi. 243. 260. is copied from his maſter Homer, *Odyſſ.* K. 527, Λ. 30, &c.

That the ſubterraneous adventures of Æneas were intended by Virgil to repreſent the *initiation* of his hero, is an elegant conjecture, which hath been laid before the public, and ſet forth to the beſt advantage, by a learned friend. The obſervations which I ſhall offer, a few pages lower, upon magic arts, and upon the abomination in which they were held, may ſerve his purpoſe as well as mine.

VIRGIL might have drawn up a ſyſtem of a future ſtate not leſs poetical, and more pleaſing, upon the ſuppoſition that, as far as human ſouls are concerned, *all ſhall terminate in good.* He might have ſuppoſed,

1. That even the puniſhments of vitious ſhades in Tartarus were purgatory, expiatory, and temporary.

2. That ſouls, after death, entered immediately into a ſtate of purgation, harſher or gentler, longer or ſhorter, according to their reſpective deſerts.

3. That the ſouls which had been virtuous, entered, after a ſhort and ſlight purification, into Elyſium.

4. That leſs accompliſhed ſhades, after their purgations, tranſmigrated into new bodies; that then if they acted well in the next trial, they ſhould no more travel from body to body, but enter into Elyſium; if they miſbehaved themſelves, and their evil deeds preponderated, then they muſt undergo another revolution of penance and tranſmigration.

5. That when they were admitted into Elyſium, they drank of the *fountain of memory*, and recovered their perſonal identity, ſo as to remember all the changes and purgations which they had undergone.

6. That

6. That virtuous love is immortal, and that death and time break not thoſe amiable bonds, but that ſuch perſons are united in Elyſium, and know no ſecond ſeparation.

7. That leſt Elyſium ſhould be too full of inhabitants, the ſouls ſhould be removed from thence, according to merit and ſeniority, to the cæleſtial manſions, and there be deified, and become *Dii minorum gentium*, inferior good Dæmons, and tutelar ſpirits to the children of men.

And ſo the moral and application of the whole would have been, according to the *golden verſes* aſcribed to Pythagoras; Keep innocency, and behave yourſelf well here upon earth, and then, when you are releaſed from the priſon of the body,

Εσεαι ἀθάνατος θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκ ἔτι θνητός.

Eris Deus immortalis, et non amplius homo.

But if our poet was an Epicurean (a point which we will conſider preſently) it was not his buſineſs to guard the doctrine of the ſoul's immortality againſt the objections with

which his brethren and friends uſed to aſſault it.

VIRGIL, after having ſhone out with full ſplendor through the ſixth book, ſets in a cloud. He firſt repreſents the ſtate of departed ſouls in Aïdes as a reality, and this he was obliged to do by the very nature of his ſubject; and then he intimates that the whole is a lying fable, and he intimates it in ſuch a manner, that it ſeems ſcarcely poſſible to clear him from this imputation.

But then, on the other hand, it is hard, ſay Virgil's friends, to ſuppoſe the ſerious and judicious poet would act ſo ſtrangely as to overſet an elegant ſyſtem which he had put together and embelliſhed with no ſmall pains, and which was partly calculated to promote religion and morality, and the hopes and fears of a future ſtate of retribution.

The objection is by no means contemptible; indeed it is ſo far from deſerving that character, that, I believe, moſt of us readers and admirers of Virgil have felt the force of it, have been offended more or leſs at

at the cloſe of this book, and have been very willing ſo to interpret it, as to diſcharge the poet from Epicuriſm, and to liſten with a favourable prejudice to all attempts of this kind.

But I am afraid that ſuch attempts cannot invalidate the obvious and the natural way of interpreting him, which hath been adopted by Servius, Ruæus, and other critics; whom, if I follow, it is with ſome reluctance, and from whom I ſhould be glad to differ.

Virgil drew up a poetical deſcription of the infernal regions, upon the commonly received notions of poſthumous rewards and puniſhments. His ſyſtem might paſs on ſtill as true or probable in the main, and might have its uſe and influence, ſuch as it was, though he thought fit to intimate at the ſame time that he himſelf was of another ſchool. Indeed he had done that already in the Eclogues, and in the Georgics, and he took care always to do it decently and obliquely, and ſo as not openly to attack and inſult the public religion.

" Cum igitur Virgilius Æneam eburnea porta
" emittit, indicat profecto, quicquid a ſe de illo
" inferorum aditu dictum eſt, in fabulis eſſe nu-
" merandum

" merandum. *Ruæus.* Vult autem intelligi falſa " eſſe omnia, quæ dixit." *Servius.*

Let us ſuppoſe that Virgil by the deſcent of Æneas intended to repreſent his *initiation*, ſtill the troubleſome concluſion remains as it was, and from the manner in which the hero is diſmiſſed after the ceremonies, we learn that in thoſe initiations the machinery and the whole ſhew was (in the poet's opinion) a repreſentation of things which had no truth and reality.

Virgil lets Æneas out at the *gate of Sleep*. The conſequence of this ſeems to be, that the hero had been aſleep, and had ſeen all theſe marvellous things in a dream or viſion. If the poet had ſaid no more, I ſhould have ſuſpected that he alluded to the ancient and common cuſtom of conſulting the gods by ſleeping in ſacred places, and receiving information by dreams. Let the reader conſider theſe lines of Virgil, and compare them with the deſcent of Æneas, and his adventures below, and thence he may perhaps be inclined to think that Æneas had ſlept, like Don Quixote, in the *Cave of Monteſinos*.

" At rex ſollicitus monſtris, oracula Fauni,
" Fatidici genitoris, adit, lucoſque ſub alta
" Conſulit

" Conſulit Albunea: nemorum quæ maxima ſacro
" Fonte ſonat, ſævamque exhalat opaca mephitim.
" Hinc Italæ gentes, omniſque Oenotria tellus,
" In dubiis reſponſa petunt. Huc dona ſacerdos
" Cum tulit, et cæſarum ovium ſub nocte ſilenti
" Pellibus incubuit ſtratis, ſomnoſque petivit,
" Multa modis ſimulacra videt volitantia miris:
" Et varias audit voces, fruiturque deorum
" Conloquio, atque imis Acheronta adfatur A-
" vernis." vii. 81.

Pomponius Mela ſays;

" Augilæ Manes tantum Deos putant: per eos
" dejerant, eos ut oracula conſulunt; precatique
" quæ volunt, ubi tumulis incubuere, pro re-
" ſponſis ferunt ſomnia."

Pauſanias, *Attic.* p. 65. Ed. Wech. ſpeaking of thoſe who conſulted Amphiaraus;

Κριὸν θύσαντες αὐτῷ, καὶ τὸ δέρμα ὑποστρωσάμενοι, καθεύδουσιν ἀναμείναντες δήλωσιν ὀνείρατος.

" Ariete ei immolato, in ſubſtrata ejus pelle
" dormiunt, ſomnii monitum expectantes."

See alſo Servius on Virgil.

But let us proceed to Virgil's famous concluſion; vi. 894.

" Sunt geminæ Somni portæ: quarum altera fertur
" Cornea; qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris;
" Altera

" Altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto :
" Sed falſa ad cælum mittunt inſomnia Manes.
" His ibi tum natum Anchiſes, unaque Sibyllam
" Proſequitur dictis, portaque emittit eburna."

In this account of the geminæ ſomni portæ, *the particle* ſed *is very oddly uſed, and I know not what to make of it. Surely inſtead of* ſed *it ſhould be* qua. *Trapp.*

He is certainly much miſtaken, and the particle *ſed* is extremely juſt and proper. The ſenſe is this; the horn gate, plain, homely, and tranſparent, lets out true dreams: the ivory gate,

fertur
Candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,

is far more elegant and reſplendent, BUT it ſends forth falſe dreams. Truth is artleſs and ſimple: poetic fiction is far more laboured and adorned, more ſtriking and alluring, *but* it is all mere error and illuſion. Or as Pindar ſays very honeſtly of his own trade,

Ἡ θαυμάλα πολλὰ
Καί πᾳ τι ϗ βροτῶν φρένας,
Ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον
Δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις
Ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι·

Χάρις

Χάρις δ' ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύ-
χει τὰ μείλιχα θνατοῖς,
Ἐπιφέροισα τιμὰν,
Καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστὸν
Ἔμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις. *Olymp.* i.

" So ancient tales record;
" And oft thoſe tales unheeding mortals charm;
" While gaudy Fiction deck'd with art,
" And dreſs'd in ev'ry winning grace
" To Truth's unornamented face
" Preferr'd, ſeduces oft the human heart.
" Add to theſe ſweet Poeſy,
" Smooth inchantreſs of mankind,
" Clad in whoſe falſe majeſty
" Fables eaſy credit find." *G. Weſt.*

Heſiod alſo inſinuates, that the proper office of a poet is to tell lies which have the appearance of truths, and to mix ſome truths with thoſe lies. He introduceth the Muſes ſaying to him;

Ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα·
Ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι.

" Scimus mendacia multa dicere veris ſimilia;
" Scimus etiam, quando voluerimus, vera loqui.
Θεογ. 27.

Virgil's deſcription of the two gates of Sleep is taken from [f] Homer, *Odyſſ.* T. 562. where Penelope, ſpeaking of true and falſe dreams, repreſents them as iſſuing out from two different gates:

Δοιαὶ γάρ τε πύλαι ἀμενηνῶν εἰσιν ὀνείρων·
Αἱ μὲν γὰρ κεράεσσι τετεύχαται, αἱ δ' ἐλέφαντι.
Τῶν οἳ μέν κ' ἔλθωσι διὰ πριστὸν ἐλέφαντος,
Οἳ δ' ἐλεφαίρονται, ἔπε' ἀκράαντα φέροντες.
Οἳ δ' αὖ διὰ ξεστῶν κεράων ἔλθωσι θύραζε,
Οἵ ῥ' ἔτυμα κραίνουσι, βροτῶν ὅτε κέν τις ἴδηται.

" Duæ enim portæ debilium ſunt ſomniorum;
" Nam alteræ cornibus factæ ſunt, alteræ ebore.
" Horum quæ veniunt per ſectum ebur,
" Hæc decipiunt, verba irrita ferentia:
" Quæ vero per polita cornua iverint foras,
" Hæc vera perficiunt, hominum quando aliquis
" viderit."

Here Homer, ſpeaking of the perfidiouſneſs of the *ivory dreams*, ſeems to give us a *Pun* for a *Reaſon*. The dreams which come δι' ἐλέφαντος, ſays he, ἐλεφαίρονται, *deceive us*. There is not the ſame near reſemblance, or *alliteration* (if I may uſe that word) between

[f] See Lucian's deſcription of the iſland of dreams, *Ver. Hiſt.* ii. 32.

κέρας

κέρας and κραίνω, and yet ſome reſemblance there is.

Virgil, following Homer, divides dreams into true and falſe; for *veræ umbræ* are *true dreams*, as Servius rightly interprets it: *Per* umbras veras, ſomnia *indicat* vera.—*Vult autem intelligi falſa eſſe omnia quæ dixit.*

The Latin language hath no word for a dream, but *ſomnium* or *inſomnium*, and therefore Virgil, to vary his phraſe, calls dreams firſt *umbræ*, and then *inſomnia*; nothing being more like a *dream* than a *ſhadow*.

Dreams, in general, may be called *vain* and *deceitful*, *ſomnia vana*, or *ſomnia falſa*, if you will, as they are oppoſed to the *real* objects which preſent themſelves to us when we are awake. But when *falſe* dreams ſtand oppoſed to *true* dreams, there the epithet *falſa* hath another meaning. True dreams repreſent what is real, and ſhew what is true; falſe dreams repreſent things which are not, or which are not true. Thus Homer and Virgil and many other poets, and indeed the nature of the thing, diſtinguiſh them.

Nonnus

Nonnus *Dionyſ.* xxxiv. 89.

Ὑπνώοντα παρήπαφεν ὄψις ὀνείρου
Κλεψινόων ἐλέφαντος ἀναΐξασα πυλάων.

Horatius, *Carm.* iii. 27.

" Ludit imago
" Vana, quæ porta fugiens eburna
" Somnium ducit."

Moſchus, *Idyll.* ii. 1.

Ἠυρώπῃ ποτε Κύπρις ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἧκεν ὄνειρον,
Νυκτὸς ὅτε τρίτατον λάχος ἵσαται, ἐγγύθι δ' ἠώς·
Ὕπνος ὅτε γλυκίων μέλιτος βλεφάροισιν ἐφίζων,
Λυσιμελὴς, πεδάοι μαλακῷ κατὰ φάεα δεσμῷ·
Εὖτε καὶ ἀτρεκέων ποιμαίνεται ἔθνος ὀνείρων.

" Europæ olim Venus ſuave ſomnium immiſit
" Quum tertia pars noctis ſtat, et aurora prope eſt;
" Quum ſomnus melle dulcior in palpebris ſedens,
" Membra reſolvens, oculos molli vinculo ligat,
" Quum et veracium paſcitur turba ſomniorum.

Horatius, *Serm.* i. x. 33.

" Vetuit tali me voce Quirinus,
" Poſt mediam noctem viſus, cum ſomnia vera."

Ovid. *Epiſt.* xix. 195.

" Sub auroram, jam dormitante lucerna,
" Somnia quo cerni tempore vera ſolent."

Tertullian,

Tertullian *De Anima*, 48.

" Certiora et colatiora ſomniari adfirmant ſub
" extimis noctibus, quaſi jam emergente anima-
" rum vigore, producto ſopore."

Plinius x. § 98.

" A vino et a cibis proxima, atque in redor-
" mitatione vana eſſe viſa, prope convenit."

Propertius iv. 7.

" Nec tu ſperne piis venientia ſomnia portis.
" Quum pia venerunt ſomnia, pondus habent."

See alſo Seneca, *Troad.* 438.

Here perhaps are more proofs brought than are wanting, *in re non dubia teſtes non neceſſarii*; but I had my reaſons, and they ſerve to confirm what follows.

Virgil, by letting Æneas out at the gate of *ſleep*, intimates that his deſcent was not real; and by letting him out at the gate of *falſe dreams*, intimates that all which had been related concerning the ſtate of the dead, and the infernal regions, was fiction and falſhood. Let us offer ſome reaſons for this conduct of the poet; and if they amount to *probabilities*, it is as much as ought to be expected.

Firſt; Why doth Virgil intimate that the deſcent of Æneas was not real?

Æneas is deſcribed as an accompliſhed hero, and under his character, as we obſerved before, that of Auguſtus is frequently delineated. His deſcent into Aïdes is a beautiful piece of poetry, but it ſeemeth to have one defect, and to lie open to one objection. It is this: incantations, evocations of the dead, converſation with the ſhades, communications with the infernal powers, necromantic divinations, all theſe belonged to the art magic, and magic was held in abomination by the Romans in Virgil's time, and before it; and hence Chriſtian emperors found it no difficulty to make very ſevere laws againſt ſuch practiſes which were already in bad repute. The poet therefore might chuſe to cloſe the narration with a hint that it was entirely a fiction.

In Homer's days, necromancy was not ſo odious, in all probability, and he makes no difficulty to ſend Ulyſſes to the regions of the dead. The Greek hero is aſſiſted and directed

directed by Circe, a goddeſs indeed, but a witch of the firſt magnitude, and a very miſchievous one.

Οὕτω δὲ αὐτέοισι (τοῖς παλαιοῖς) χρῆμα ἱρώτατον ἡ μαντοσύνη ἐδόκεεν, ὥστε δὴ Ὀδυσεὺς ἐπειδὴ ἔκαμε πλανεόμενος, ἐθελήσας ἀτρεκὲς ἀκοῦσαι περὶ τῶν ἑωυτοῦ πρηγμάτων, ἐς τὸν ἀΐδην ἀπίκετο—εἰς λόγους ἐλθεῖν Τιρησίῃ ἐπιθυμέων.

"Adeo illis (veteribus) res ſanctiſſima viſa "divinatio eſt. Itaque Ulyſſes cum in errore "illo ſuo laboraret, verum audire cupiens de "rebus ſuis, ad inferos deſcendit — in collo- "quium Tireſiæ venire deſiderans." *Lucian.* De Aſtrol. 24.

But Virgil, when he introduces the unhappy Dido deceiving her ſiſter, and pretending to ſeek a cure for her love by the aid of a prieſteſs and a ſorcereſs, makes her apologize for having recourſe to Magic arts, and excuſe herſelf by the plea of cruel neceſſity. *Æn.* iv. 480.

"Oceani juxta finem, ſolemque cadentem,
"Ultimus Æthiopum locus eſt.—
"Hinc mihi Maſſylæ gentis monſtrata ſacerdos,
"Heſperidum templi cuſtos, epulaſque draconi
"Quæ dabat.—
"Hæc ſe carminibus promittit ſolvere mentes

" Quas velit; aſt aliis duras immittere curas:
" Siſtere aquam fluviis, et vertere ſidera retro:
" Nocturnoſque ciet manes. Mugire videbis
" Sub pedibus terram, et deſcendere montibus
" ornos.
" TESTOR, cara, deos, et te, germana, tuum-
" que
" Dulce caput, magicas invitam accingier artes."

Where Servius:

" *Invitam* — quia cum multa ſacra Romani ſuſ-
" ciperent, magica ſemper damnarunt: probroſa
" enim ars habita eſt. Ideo excuſat."

Apuleius, ix. p. 197.

" —ad familiares feminarum artes accenditur:
" magnaque cura requiſitam veratricem (l. vete-
" ratricem) quandam feminam, quæ devotioni-
" bus ac maleficiis—quidvis efficere poſſe crede-
" batur, multis exorat precibus. Tunc ſaga
" illa et divinipotens primis adhuc armis facino-
" roſæ diſciplinæ ſuæ velitatur."

Auguſtin *De Civ. Dei*, viii. 19.

" Porro adverſus magicas artes—ipſam publi-
" cam lucem teſtem citabo. Cur enim tam gra-
" viter iſta plectuntur ſeveritate legum? — An
" forte iſtas leges Chriſtiani inſtituerunt, quibus
" artes magicæ puniuntur, ſecundum quem
" alium ſenſum niſi quod hæc maleficia generi
" humano

" humano pernicioſa eſſe non dubium eſt? Ait
" Poëta clariſſimus,
" *Teſtor, cara, Deos*, &c.
" Illud etiam quod alio loco de his artibus dicit:
" *Atque ſatas alio vidi traducere meſſes:*
" Eo quod hac peſtifera ſceleratáque doctrina,
" fructus alieni in alias terras transferri perhi-
" bentur, nonne in Duodecim Tabulis, id eſt,
" Romanorum antiquiſſimis legibus, Cicero
" commemorat eſſe conſcriptum, et ei qui hoc
" fecerit ſupplicium conſtitutum? Poſtremo,
" ipſe Apuleius numquid apud judices Chriſtia-
" nos de magicis artibus accuſatus eſt?"

The venerable Sibyl in the Æneis ſeems to have been one of the trade, though Virgil ſets a handſome gloſs upon it.

The diſciples of Epicurus muſt have had a more particular deteſtation for magical arts, becauſe they looked upon the whole ſcience as impoſture and villainy, contrived to deceive the credulous, to keep up ſuperſtition, and to do miſchief.

I come now to anſwer the ſecond queſtion. Why did Virgil intimate, that all which had been related by him concerning the ſtate of the dead and the infernal regions, was fiction and falſehood?

I know of no better reply than this, that Virgil had ſtudied and embraced the Epicurean philoſophy, and whatever uſe he may have made, as a poet, of the doctrines of other ſects, yet this was his favourite ſyſtem, and he was willing to let the learned reader know it, and not to paſs for a deſerter of his own principles, which in the philoſophical world was held a diſhonourable thing.

Servius was ſo perſuaded of Virgil's Epicuriſm, that he often takes notice of it, and collects it even from ſome paſſages which will not prove it.

As Virgil's poetical labours are comprized in three great and diſtinct works, the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Æneis, he hath taken particular care in each of the three to give hints of his ſentiments, that poſterity might know to what ſect and party he belonged. He hath not done it bluntly and dogmatically, but rather politely and indirectly.

His ſixth Eclogue is inſcribed to Varus, who alſo was an Epicurean, in which he intro-

introduces Silenus deſcribing the formation of the world according to the Epicurean ſyſtem. A cruel inſult upon this poor drunken god, to make him ſing an atheiſtical ballad! 31.

" Namque canebat, uti magnum per inane coacta
" Semina terrarumque, animæque, mariſque
" fuiſſent,
" Et liquidi ſimul ignis: ut his exordia primis
" Omnia, et ipſe tener mundi concreverit orbis.--
" Hinc lapides Pyrrhæ jactos," &c.

So Lucretius, i. 420.

" Omnis, ut eſt, igitur, per ſe, Natura, duabus
" Conſiſtit rebus; nam *corpora* ſunt, et *inane*,
" Hæc in quo ſita ſunt, et qua diverſa feruntur."

The god firſt diſcovers the grand ſecret, that there was no providence, and that all was made by chance, and then proceeds to the popular and the fabulous religion.

" Hortatur Virgilius Muſas, ver. 13. ad refe-
" renda ea quæ Silenus cantaverat pueris: nam
" vult exſequi ſectam Epicuream, quam didice-
" rant, tam Virgilius quam Varus, docente Sci-
" rone; et quaſi ſub perſona Sileni, Sironem
" inducit loquentem. Chromim autem et Mna-
" ſylum, ſe et Varum vulti accipi. Quibus

 " ideo

" ideo conjungit puellam, ut oſtendat plenam
" ſectam Epicuream, quæ nihil ſine voluptate
" vult eſſe perfectum." *Servius.*

In his Georgics alſo he gives us his philoſophical ſentiments, ii. 490.

" Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoſcere cauſſas,
" Atque metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum
" Subjecit pedibus, ſtrepitumque Acherontis
" avari."

Here are not only the ſentiments of Epicurus, but the expreſſions of Lucretius:

" Cætera, quæ fieri in terris cæloque tuentur
" Mortales, pavidis cum pendent mentibu' ſæpe,
" Efficiunt animos humiles formidine Divûm,
" Depreſſoſque premunt ad terram, propterea
" quod
" *Ignorantia cauſſarum* conferre Deorum
" Cogit ad imperium *res*, et concedere regnum."
vi. 49.

" Quare Relligio *pedibus ſubjecta* viciſſim
" Obteritur, nos exæquat victoria cælo."
i. 79.

" Et *metus* ille foras præceps *Acherontis* agendus
" Funditus, humanam qui vitam turbat ab imo.
iii. 37.

" decli-

" declinando faciunt primordia motus
" Principium quoddam, quod *fati* fœdera rum-
" pat, &c.
" *fatis* avulſa voluntas." ii. 253.

" Happy, ſays the poet, in the firſt place " is the philoſopher; in the ſecond, the " country-man. Now under the notion of " a philoſopher, he deſcribes an Epicurean, " having been bred under his maſter Sciron, " a teacher in that ſect: and in three lines " he has admirably couched the principal " opinions they were known by, or valued " themſelves upon, that there is no divine " Providence, no deſtiny or divination, and " no immortality of the ſoul, &c.

" And yet, *the* DIVINE *Virgil*, ſays our " judicious author. He is very eaſily ſatis- " fied, if what little he comprehends of " him appears to have *divinity* in it." *Bentley*, Remarks on free-thinking.

The third mark which he hath given of his attachment to Epicurus, is in the cloſe of the ſixth book of the Æneis, where, after a laboured deſcription of the infernal regions, and in it a very formidable repreſentation of future

future puniſhments, he diſmiſſes his readers with the comfortable ſuggeſtion that it is all a fable, and a dream from the *ivory-gate*; or in the words of Seneca:

" Poſt mortem nihil eſt, ipſaque mors nihil.—
" Tænara, et aſpero
" Regnum ſub domino, limen et obſidens
" Cuſtos non facili Cerberus oſtio,
" Rumores vacui, verbaque inania,
" Et par *ſollicito* fabula *ſomnio*." *Troad.* 327.

So Cornelius Severus, in his *Ætna*, charges the poets with forging lies about the infernal regions, the puniſhment of Tityus, Tantalus, and Ixion, the tribunals of Minos and Æacus, 83.

" Quicquid et interius *falſi* ſibi conſcia terra eſt."

One of the difficulties in Virgil's deſcription of the ſubterraneous regions, is his placing Elyſium, *aëris in campis, in the fields of air*. He ſays of Æneas, Anchiſes, and the Sibyl, 887.

" tota paſſim regione vagantur
" Aëris in campis latis."

So they were *air-walkers*, or, as you may expreſs it better in Greek, Ἀερο-βάται. But in that

that language, they who loſe themſelves in idle ſpeculations, and run into whimſies, are ſaid Ἀεροβατεῖν. See Lucian *Prometh.* vi. p. 33, 34. Quart. Edit. and Ariſtophanes *Nub.* 225. Yet I will by no means affirm that Virgil had this double ſenſe in view, or that his words will not bear another interpretation. See Servius and Ruæus.

" Cum de Inferis agit Virgilius, id laxe intelli-
" gendum eſt, ut cum Græci verba faciunt περὶ
" τοῦ Ἅιδου, quod vita defunctorum ſtatum potius,
" quam locum, ſignificat. Ita Inferi apud poe-
" tam: quid enim umbris et locis ſubterraneis
" cum ſole et ſideribus, cum largo æthere, et
" lumine purpureo:—Atque hic etiam Platonem
" imitari Virgilium, ut alibi non raro, ſuſpicor."
&c. Burnet, *Archæol.* 358.

Virgil, in his *Ciris*, if that poem be his, hath declared himſelf an Epicurean, ver. 3.

" Cecropius ſuaves exſpirans hortulus auras
" Florentis viridi Sophiæ complectitur umbra."

And Joſeph Scaliger, in his learned notes, hath taken pains to ſhew Virgil's attachment to that ſect.

Lucan,

Lucan, ſpeaking of the future ſtate of heroic ſouls, takes a noble flight above the groveling ſons of Epicurus, ix. 1.

" At non in Pharia Manes jacuere favilla,
" Nec cinis exiguus tantam compeſcuit umbram.
" Proſiluit buſto, ſemiuſtaque membra relin-
" quens,
" Degeneremque rogum, ſequitur convexa To-
" nantis.
" Qua niger aſtriferis connectitur axibus aër,
" Quodque patet terras inter, lunæque meatus,
" Semidei Manes habitant, quos ignea virtus
" Innocuos vita patientes ætheris imi
" Fecit, et æternos animam collegit in orbes.
" Non illuc auro poſiti, nec ture ſepulti
" Perveniunt. Illic poſtquam ſe lumine vero
" Implevit, ſtellaſque vagas miratus, et aſtra
" Fixa polis, vidit quanta ſub nocte jaceret
" Noſtra dies, riſitque ſui ludibria trunci."

In the religious ſyſtems, nothing ſo much ſhocked the Epicureans as the doctrine of future puniſhments which might be everlaſting;

" nam ſi certum finem eſſe viderent
" Ærumnarum homines, aliqua ratione valerent
" Relligionibus, atque minis obſiſtere vatum:
" Nunc

" Nunc ratio nulla eſt reſtandi, nulla facultas,
" Æternas quoniam pœnas in morte timendum."
Lucretius, i. 108.

Therefore they magnified their father Epicurus, who had obtained a complete victory over religion or ſuperſtition:

" Quare relligio pedibus ſubjecta viciſſim
" Obteritur, nos exæquat victoria cælo."

Tanaquil Faber, and others, have vainly endeavoured to juſtify Epicurus and Lucretius from the charge of impiety. Faber was very learned, and very ingenious; but I know not how, he often affected to write like a Debauché and a Libertine.

" Thoſe who believed no god at all, or at
" leaſt no providence, accounted all religi-
" on to be nothing but ſuperſtition. And it is
" a weak and ſilly apology a late commenta-
" tor on Lucretius [Tan. Faber] makes for
" his ſaying, ſo much miſchief had been
" done by religion; *by religion*, ſaith he,
" *he meant ſuperſtition:* for he accounted all
" religion to be nothing elſe but ſuperſtition.
" And thoſe in our age [Hobbes, Leviath.]
" who

" who can find no other difference between " them, *but that one is allowed, and the other* " *not*; *or one is what we like, and the other* " *what we diſlike*, do deſtroy any real differ- " ence between them, and make only *re-* " *ligion a ſuperſtition in faſhion*, and *ſuper-* " *ſtition a religion out of faſhion.*" Stillingfleet, *Serm.* viii. Vol. II.

" Otio autem ſuo abutuntur, ut Gaſſendus, " Faber, aliique, qui Epicuri librum περὶ ὁσιότητος, " ejus ſectæ pietatem erga deos, et religionem " pro ſuperſtitione tantum, metuque deorum " inani a Lucretio hoc loco poſitam eſſe crepant; " quaſi poeta non omnem de providentia opinio- " nem [g] ſuſtulit, aut ille eſſet ſuperſtitioſus, qui " Deum aliquid agere, aut humana curare exiſti- " maret." *Creech* ad Lucretium, i. 63.

Epicurus, as his diſciples boaſted, had overſet all religion by two demonſtrations, firſt that the ſoul periſhed at death; ſecondly, that the deity, if there was one, concerned not himſelf with human affairs, and had neither benevolence nor malevolence;

" Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira."

SINCE men have naturally a deſire of immortality, and an abhorrence for death and

[g] He ſhould have ſaid *ſuſtuliſſet*.

annihilation, it may be aſked, whence came it to paſs that ſeveral perſons in the Pagan world not only embraced the opinion of the ſoul's mortality, but even received it with complacency and ſatisfaction?

This complacency and ſatisfaction might perhaps be queſtioned. *Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die*, is a ſpeech which may be made with a ſmiling countenance, and with an aking heart.

But, granting the fact to be true, two cauſes ſeem to have produced this effect.

Firſt, a diſlike of the popular religion, which was abſurd and oppreſſive, directed by prieſt-craft, and overrun with ſuperſtition, and which produced many vile and miſchievous effects. Beſides, according to thoſe vulgar ſyſtems, human ſouls, when they quitted the body, repaired to the infernal regions. The gods, who preſided, there were capricious and cruel;

" Neſciaque humanis precibus mañſueſcere corda.

There the poor unhappy ſhades, for whom thoſe deities might entertain an unaccountable

able hatred, would be inceſſantly tormented by arbitrary maſters from whom much was to be feared, and little to be hoped.

A hatred for ſuch a religion, and a dread of ſuch doctrines, drove them into the other extreme, and made them reject a providence and a future ſtate.

Secondly, a bad mind and a vitious diſpoſition. I am not willing to impute this to all thoſe, without exception, who held the mortality of the ſoul. There might be perſons amongſt them who had more benevolence, more honour, and more virtue, than many a believer of the contrary doctrine. But this is certain, that a vitious man muſt be a very partial and prejudiced judge of the queſtion concerning a future ſtate, that he will be plagued with juſt fears and apprehenſions of his condition in that ſtate, and inclined to conſider annihilation on its moſt acceptable ſide, and to take refuge in it as in a ſhelter from divine juſtice.

There is ſomething particular in the religion of the Siameſe, as it is repreſented to us by Chaumont, La Loubiere, De Choiſy, and other travellers. They acknowledge a ſupreme

ſupreme God, but believe that he lives and ever did live (if it may be called living) in perfect indolence and abſolute inactivity. There are inferior deities who govern the world. They ſuppoſe a hell, or purgatory, and a paradiſe, or elyſium, a ſtate of temporary puniſhments, and temporary rewards. After this enſues a tranſmigration of ſouls into the bodies of men or brutes, of princes or beggars, of lions or hogs, that is, into a better or a worſe condition, through many revolutions of ages. But the ſouls which have behaved themſelves well under various changes and trials, will at laſt be releaſed from the fatigue of tranſmigration, and enter into a ſtate of calm inſenſibility or annihilation, which is a kind of Apotheoſis, and the higheſt reward.

Obſerve that in Siam, the climate is hot, the inhabitants poor and lazy ſlaves, the government moſt deſpotic and tyrannical, and the puniſhments arbitrary and ſevere. Theſe circumſtances might incline the people to conſider happineſs as conſiſting in a ſort of ſtupid unfeeling ſerenity, in an indolence of body and of mind, in an exemption from

the drudgery of working and of thinking, and from the inſolence of unmerciful maſters. This might reconcile them to annihilation, as to a condition comparatively [a] not undeſireable: " There the wicked ceaſe from trou-
" bling, and there the weary be at reſt.
" There the priſoners reſt together; they
" hear not the voice of the oppreſſor."

IT would make one ſmile to ſee poetical divines wonderfully tender and candid in their judgments of Virgil's philoſophical and theological principles, looking upon him as upon a devout and religious creature, one who was honoured with glimpſes of the glad tidings of ſalvation, and a kind of *Minor prophet*. Yet I would not willingly cenſure them; for after all, a man can have no more judgment than falls to his ſhare; and beſides, it ſeems to be an error on the right ſide, a good-natured miſtake, an innocent ſimplicity which thinketh no evil.

[a] Longa quieſcendi tempora Fata dabunt.

THEM

THEM who are without, God judgeth. He beſt knoweth how to deal with the Pagan world in general, and in particular with thoſe Pagans who were ſo far eſtranged from him, as to fall even into the Epicurean impiety. To his righteous judgment let us leave them.

But hence it appears, that the learned age of Auguſtus, with all its polite advantages, was ſadly corrupted in matters of religion: that the Epicurean doctrine had ſpread itſelf through the Roman empire, and that perſons of the brighteſt abilities and higheſt ſtations being unhappily infected with it, were men of that FIRST PHILOSOPHY, which in a Chriſtian country, and in the eighteenth century, hath been publicly recommended to us by patriots and geniuſes, compared with whom Epicurus was a gentleman, a philoſopher, a reaſoner, and a ſcholar.

Such was the ſtate of the world in the days of Auguſtus and of Virgil. A plain proof how much it ſtood in need of that divine teacher, that *Sun of Righteouſneſs*, who,

to diſpel thoſe gloomy clouds, aroſe with ſalvation in his rays!

" Hail, holy LIGHT, offspring of Heav'n firſt-
" born!
" Thee I reviſit, and thy vital lamp,
" Eſcap'd the Stygian pool, and realms of Night,
" And taught by thee alone to re-aſcend."

FINIS.

C.MC
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM